Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-036
Wednesday
24 February 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-036 *24 February 1988*

CONTENTS

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Foreign Ministers Issue 'Press Release' 1
Shevardnadze, Jakes Discuss Shultz Talks 1
Further on Talks 2
Shevardnadze Returns to Moscow After Meeting 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Kashlev 'Concerned' by FRG Breach on Manuevers *[Warsaw PAP]* 3
Balkan Foreign Ministers To Meet in Belgrade 3
Humanity 'a Little Wiser' After Summit Year *[Falin in APN MILITARY BULLETIN No 1]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

TV Shows Shevardnadze 22 Feb News Conference 5
PRAVDA Reports News Conference *[24 Feb]* 6
Further on Shultz Moscow News Conference *[PRAVDA 24 Feb]* 10
Biryukov Views Work Ahead for Soviet, U.S. 12
Shultz Post-Moscow Brussels News Conference 12
U.S. Reaction to Shultz Moscow Talks Noted 13
Reagan Remarks on European Armament Noted 13
More on Reagan Remarks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Feb]* 14
U.S. Allocates More Funds for 'Secret Projects' 14
Portugal's Cavaco Silva in U.S. To Discuss Aid 14
UN To Consider U.S. Closing of PLO Office 15
Peace Committee Head on Dartmouth Conference 15
Dartmouth Meeting Ends 15
U.S. Navy Secretary Resigns Over Budget 16
Weinberger to President's Intelligence Board 16
TASS Notes South Dakota Primary Results 16
U.S. Presidential Hopeful Dukakis Profiled *[Bogomolov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Feb]* 17

China

'Chill' in Sino-U.S. Relations Noted 18
PRC Vice Minister on Space Research Program *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Feb]* 18

Northeast Asia

Japanese Industry Interested in Arms Development *[Kalinin]* 19
Japanese-U.S. Military Cooperation Criticized *[Vinogradov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Feb]* 20
Japan's Storage of U.S. Hardware Not Ruled Out 20
Japan Develops Computer Military Command Center 21
South Korean Students Seize U.S. Culture Center 21
DPRK Denounces 'Team Spirit-88' Exercises 21
Oriental Studies Director Views Korean Issue *[Kapitsa]* 21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Filipinos 'Struggle' Against U.S. Military Bases 22
U.S. 'Control' of Economy 22
Talks Begin in March 23

Gorbachev Message Conveyed to Suharto *[Jakarta]* 23
Gromyko Sends Message to South Pacific Forum 23
SRV, PRC Statements on Territorial Violation 24
SRV Minister Speaks on Cambodia Withdrawal 24
Lao, Thai Military Delegations End Talks 24

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan's Noorani Charges Soviets Violate Pact 24
Noorani 'Distorting' Truth *[Ilyichev]* 24
Pakistan Seeks To 'Delay' Accords 25
Afghanistan's Rafi' on Reconciliation Process *[IZVESTIYA 24 Feb]* 25
Gandhi Message Presented to Najibullah 27
Syrian Leader's 24 Feb Visit Reportedly Denied *[Kuwait KUNA]* 27
U.S. Advantages, 'Islamic Factor' in Gulf War *[Vasilyev in IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* 27
Official Praises Kuwait's Efforts in Gulf War *[Kuwait KUNA]* 29
Gorbachev Messages to Arab Leaders Outlined *[Kuwait KUNA]* 29
Algerian Leader Receives Gorbachev Message 30
Tudeh Party CC Plenum Reelects Leader *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 30
Briefs 30
Afghan Electrical Equipment Contract 30
Sri Lankan Exchange Protocol 30

East Europe

GDR Spokesman on 25 Feb Missile Withdrawal 31
Gromyko, Nemeth Discuss 'Fruitful' Relations 31
Hungarian-USSR Ties 'Between Equals' Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Feb]* 31
USSR-CSSR Talks on Nuclear Power Cooperation *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 32

West Europe

Levin Views Kohl Remarks on U.S. Talks 32
Kohl Cited on Arms Issues *[PRAVDA 21 Feb]* 33
FRG Refuses To Extradite 'Nazi Butchers' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* 34
Further on Visit of UK's Howe to Kiev *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Feb]* 34
Meets Ukrainian Officials *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Feb]* 35
Leader of Portuguese Socialist Party Reelected 35
Finnish President, Kovalev Discuss Relations 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Armenians Demonstrate in Nagorno-Karabakh 36
Politburo Decision Protested *[AFP]* 36
Protests Becoming 'Nationalist' *[Vienna]* 36
Party Urges End to Dispute 36
Armenian Request 'Irresponsible' 37
Razumovskiy Addresses Activists 37
'Nationalist' Protests Continue *[AFP]* 37
Situation Outlined 37
Reports on Baltic 'Independence' Days Observed 38
Estonian 'Extremists' Criticized 38
Estonians Protest U.S. 'Meddling' 38
Estonians Commemorate 1918 Battle 39
Estonian Historians Meet 39
Provocations in Lithuania Scored 40
Kazakh Scholar Criticizes Erroneous Nationalism
[Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Feb] 40

Significance of CPSU Plenum Analyzed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb]* 45
Dissident Freed From Psychiatric Hospital *[AFP]* 48
Ukrainian Party Censures Donetsk University *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 9 Feb]* 48
Ukrainian CP CC Sums Up Discussion *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 16 Feb]* 49
'Lessons in Democracy' To Be Learned in Ukraine *[PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 51
Patriarch Addresses UNESCO Soiree *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Feb]* 54
Official Describes Efforts Against Drug Use 54
Statistics Chief Interviewed on Census *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 55
'Top Priority' Program on Informal Groups *[Pozner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 55
PRAVDA To Publish Eight-Page Friday Edition *[12 Feb]* 58
Trotskiy's Pivotal Role in Red Army Denied *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb]* 58

Agricultural

CPSU Issues Resolution on Rostov Agriculture 60
Nikonov Tours Kazakhstan, Visits Oblasts 60
Visits Kokchetav Oblast 60
Addresses Seminar 61
Committee Encourages Individual Stock Breeding *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 10 Feb]* 61
Media Report 15-19 Feb Agricultural Developments 62

Military

Further Reportage on Anniversary Jubilee 63
Foreign Delegations Listed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]* 63
Zaykov Closing Remarks 63
Yazov Hosts Reception 64
Yazov Presents Jubilee Medals *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]* 64
Kulikov, Others Receive Awards *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]* 64
Officials Lay Wreaths 65
Yazov Congratulates Servicemen *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 65
Yazov, Ligachev Attend Meeting *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Feb]* 66
Suslov Chairs Celebration 66
Lushev on Duty, Courage, Military Jubilee *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb]* 66
Kulikov on 'Defense Shield, Reliable Guard' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Feb]* 68
DOSAAF Official Views Military Celebrations 71
Central Committee Adopts Veterans' Resolution 71
MOSCOW NEWS Interviews General Tretyak *[No 8]* 72

Pact Foreign Ministers Issue 'Press Release'

LD232020 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1942 GMT 23 Feb 88

["Press Release on a Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact States in Prague on 23 February 1988"]

[Text] Prague, 23 Feb (TASS)—A meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact states was held in Prague on 23 February 1988.

Taking part in the meeting were: Petur Mladenov, BCP Central Committee Politburo member and minister of foreign affairs of the Bulgarian People's Republic; Gyula Horn, MSZMP Central Committee member and state secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic; Herbert Krolikowski, SED Central Committee member, GDR state secretary, and first deputy foreign minister; Henryk Jaroszek, Polish People's Republic deputy minister of foreign affairs; Ioan Totu, RCP Central Committee PEC candidate member and minister of foreign affairs Romanian SR; Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs; and Bohuslav Chnoupek, CPCZ Central Committee member and CSSR minister of foreign affairs.

USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the participants in the meeting in detail on the course and the results of the negotiations with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, which took place in Moscow on 21 and 22 February 1988.

The heads of the allied fraternal countries' delegations expressed their appreciation of the USSR's approach in the negotiations with the United States in Moscow and also full support for the results achieved. They see the results of the negotiations as the start to preparations for the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Moscow in the first half of this year.

The participants in the meeting stressed the need to intensify as quickly as possible the elaboration of an agreement on the reduction and limitation of the number of strategic offensive weapons and all the documents connected with this, so that it can be signed during the next top-level meeting in Moscow.

They welcomed the efforts to reach an agreement on the treaty on limiting antimissile systems on the basis of the formulations in the joint statement by the USSR and the United States of 10 December 1987. The participants in the meeting expressed their interest in progress in the complex negotiations, conducted stage-by-stage, between the USSR and the United States on a ban on nuclear weapons tests. They discussed the unsolved problems in stepping up the achievement of a global, comprehensive ban on chemical weapons under effective controls.

They discussed the situation at the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting and spoke in favor of a speedier adoption of a mandate and the start of negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

The participants in the meeting underscored the need to solve regional problems through political means.

They welcomed the intention to continue the regular dialogue between the USSR and the United States at the highest political level and to expand it to the military sphere.

The delegation chiefs were received by Milos Jakes, CPCZ general secretary.

The meeting of the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation.

Shevardnadze, Jakes Discuss Shultz Talks

LD231837 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Prague February 23 TASS—The Czechoslovak leadership and the people of Czechoslovakia support the Soviet Union's course towards diminishing the threat of nuclear war and achieving a change for the better in international affairs, Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, said today.

He was addressing Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, in Prague to attend a meeting of Warsaw Treaty foreign ministers.

On instructions from General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, Shevardnadze informed the Czechoslovak Communist Party leader about the results of the Moscow talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

It was observed that the Soviet-American talks reaffirmed the mutual understanding of the importance of advancement in the military-political sphere on the basis of the Washington summit agreements both for Soviet-American relations and for improving the world situation in general.

Jakes noted that Czechoslovakia fully backed the efforts directed at concluding a treaty on 50-per cent cuts in the strategic offensive arsenals of the USSR and the United States given observance of the ABM Treaty.

Shevardnadze set out the Soviet leadership's assessment of the situation in the world and in Europe following Gorbachev's visit to the United States and the conclusion of the INF Treaty.

Jakes pointed to incompatibility of the plans to "offset" the eliminated missiles by building up other types of U.S. and NATO weaponry in Europe and around Europe and the task of preserving and developing positive trends that became evident in strengthening European and world security.

Both parties noted with satisfaction that the peaceful foreign policy course of the socialist countries, based on new political thinking in international affairs, found extensive support of world public opinion and enhanced prestige of socialism around the world.

Further on Talks

LD232002 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Prague, 23 Feb (TASS)—M. Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee, received today E.A. Shevardnadze general secretary, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and the USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is in Prague in connection with the meeting of foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

On behalf of M.S. Gorbachev, E.A. Shevardnadze conveyed to M. Jakes greetings and good wishes and on his instruction informed the CPCZ Central Committee general secretary about the results of the talks with the U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, which were held in Moscow. It was stressed that the Soviet-U.S. talks reaffirmed the mutual understanding of the importance of making progress in the military and political sphere on the basis of the Washington summit agreements both for Soviet-U.S. relations and for the improvement of the situation in the world as a whole.

M. Jakes noted that the CSSR leadership and the Czechoslovak people support the Soviet policy toward reducing the nuclear threat and creating a turning point for the better in international affairs. This is in keeping with the interests of strengthening peace and universal security. Czechoslovakia fully supports the efforts aimed at concluding the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the United States under the conditions of the ABM Treaty.

M. Jakes expressed the hope that it will be possible to sign this treaty during the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

E.A. Shevardnadze expressed the evaulation by the Soviet leadership of the situation in the world and Europe following the visit by M.S. Gorbachev to the United States, and the conclusion of a treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

M. Jakes stressed the incompatibility of plans for "compensation" of the missiles being scrapped by means of increasing other types of U.S. and NATO armaments in and around Europe with the task of maintaining and developing the positive trends noted in the cause of strengthening European and world security.

The collocutors noted with satisfaction that the peace loving foreign policy line of the socialist countries, based on new political thinking in international affairs, is widely supported by the world public and raises the prestige of socialism in the world.

During the conversation, M. Jakes dealt with questions of implementing the decisions of the CPCZ Central Committee December 1987 Plenum directed at the comprehensive restructuring and deepening of socialist democracy in the CSSR.

E.A. Shevardnadze talked about the work of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, about the preparations under way in the USSR for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. M. Jakes conveyed wishes for success to the CPSU and Soviet people in implementing the tasks of restructuring.

The parties expressed deep satisfaction at the dynamic development of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation in the political, economic, cultural, and other spheres, and stressed the importance of deepening progressive new forms of links between enterprises, groups of scientists, and designers and creative unions.

E.A. Shevardnadze wished the fraternal Czechoslovak people great success in fulfilling the program of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, adopted by the 17th CPCZ Congress.

Shevardnadze Returns to Moscow After Meeting

LD231744 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1729 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Prague, 23 Feb (TASS)—Following the conclusion of the meeting of foreign ministers of the member-states of the Warsaw Pact, Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, has left for home. He was seen off at Prague airport by Bohuslav Chnoupek, CPCZ Central Committee member and CSSR minister of foreign affairs, and other officials.

Among those seeing him off was Viktor Lomakin, USSR ambassador to the CSSR.

Kashlev 'Concerned' by FRG Breach on Manuevers
LD200030 Warsaw PAP in English 1938 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Vienna, Feb. 19: The Federal Republic of Germany has breached the decision of the Stockholm conference on notifying of planned great military maneuvres with over 75 thousand soldiers involved, two years in advance. Such an accusation was forwarded by Soviet Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev today at a plenary meeting of the delegations of 35 states participating in the Vienna'86 CSCE meeting.

The Soviet Union is deeply concerned by the great military maneuvres planned to take place in the FRG in 1988. This anxiety has found expression in the aide d'memoire issued on February 17 by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the FRG Embassy in Moscow. The plan of military activities forwarded by the Government of the FRG in December 1986 did not contain any information about plans to hold military maneuvres involving 40 thousand soldiers in 1988. Now it turns out that military maneuvres of significantly greater scope are in the plans. Information presented by the Bonn government to the participants of the Stockholm conference indicates that military maneuvres, involving 97 thousand soldiers, are to take place in the FRG this August.

Such tremendous, multi-prong maneuvres exceed the scale admissible under point 60 of the final document of the Stockholm conference which stipulates that participating states will not conduct military activities involving over 75 thousand soldiers which require notification if they do not inform about them two years in advance. The Soviet Union awaits appropriate explanations, Ambassador Kashlev stated.

Balkan Foreign Ministers To Meet in Belgrade
LD232041 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Belgrade February 23 TASS—TASS special correspondents Viktor Kuznetsov and Vladimir Matyash report:

The state flags of six Balkan countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia are fluttering outside the Sava-Centar Palace of Congresses in Belgrade. A meeting of the foreign ministers of the Balkan states is due to open here on Wednesday, February 24.

That will be the meeting of the heads of foreign policy departments of the countries of that important region of south-east Europe which belong to opposite social systems and military-political alliances. They will discuss cardinal regional and international problems, bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the Balkan peninsula, the proposal of socialist states, specifically Bulgaria and Romania, that a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons be established there. The discussion of the question of more active involvement of the Balkan countries into the all-European process is planned to hold a major place. A thorough exchange of opinions will be held on problems of cooperaiton in economy, integration of production and specialisation, energetics, agriculture, transport, science and technology, culture, environmental protection.

The meeting has undoubtedly been largely promoted by the general improvement of the political climate in the world, primarily the positive changes which have lately taken place in East-West relations. These positive tendencies found concrete incarnation above all in the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles which lent an important impetus to the peoples' struggle for peace and security.

The Belgrade meeting will centre on the question of establishing in the region a zone of peace and cooperation, free from nuclear weapons. It is obvious that attainment of that goal would not only serve the cause of consolidating peace and security in the Balkan peninsula, but would be a stabilising factor of really global dimensions.

The first step to a nuclear-free Balkan peninsula could be adoption of the obligation not to deploy nuclear weapons on its territory, not to accept new ones where they were deployed and to lessen the stockpiles of such weapons. Such an approach makes it possible in the process of preparatory nuclear zone establishing work to carry out stage by stage relevant restrictive measures with a view of full nuclear demilitarization of the region.

The peoples of the Balkan countries, the world public expect that the useful exchange of opinions in the capital of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the quest for possibilities and ways for multilateral cooperation of the states of the region will promote consolidation of peace and international security in that part of the globe, construction of the all-European home without wars and armed conflicts.

Humanity 'a Little Wiser' After Summit Year
PM231225 Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No 1, Jan 88 pp 1-2

[Valentin Falin article: "The Curtain of Ignorance Must Fall"]

[Text] A possibility is normally an objective thing, especially in interstate relations. It depends on the leaders of states whether a possibility is used in the interest of one country or several countries and, if it is, to what extent. I use the word "interest" here because the matter concerns foreign policy and the international community as a whole.

In this context, the subjective factor acquires a special significance. To what extent are a country's government and its individual leaders aware of the needs of development and of the restrictions which time imposes on human activity? To what extent is this or that system prepared to react to developments in a constructive way? Does it realise that everything in this world is interrelated and inter-dependent? And, finally, is it aware of the fact that by harming another state it harms itself and that by disregarding the interests of its adversary it betrays its own interests?

Leo Tolstoy once said that there were three kinds of morality. Considering moral only what is good for oneself is the morality of the savages. Considering moral only what is good for one's own circle is the morality of the barbarians. And, lastly, considering moral what is good for all humanity is the morality of the human beings.

I think it is too early to say that all countries are guided in their policy by human morality. Egocentrism and egotism still govern many of their actions. Yet, the past year has brought about some changes. It has made humanity a little wiser. In any case, it has reduced the risk of catastrophe and opened up better prospects for the future, providng new evidence that is is co-operation, not confrontation, that ensures further development of civilisation.

What, in the final analysis, did the Soviet Union and the United States do to ensure that the first step towards a better, non-nuclear world ceases to be a dream? In a nutshell, they called common sense common sense. Ideological, religious and other factors lost their paramount importance. Something different and more important has come to the fore. To be able to argue and preserve their identity, people, systems and countries must live. And for this they have to come to terms with one another.

I think this is a major moral and political result of the past year, which will carry on into the new year. It is knowledge that will free man from mistrust and suspicion, which sometimes borders on mysticism. The curtain of ignorance must fall. Don't trust and expect to be deceived, said the great Frenchmen of the past. It is trust that leads to security and security allows all nations to have equal opportunities for using the benefits of peace.

If the ability to see reality as it is, which we acquired in 1987, is not lost or sacrificed to some opportunistic interests, the Soviet Union, the United States and all the other countries will be able to make this year a new major step towards bringing about a radical improvement in the international situation. There are objective conditions for this. The only thing needed is to go ahead without stopping in the beginning of the road, without hesitating and without dragging one's feet.

United States & Canada

TV Shows Shevardnadze 22 Feb News Conference

LD222322 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2032 GMT 22 Feb 88

[News conference given by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 22 February—recorded]

[Text] [Shevardnadze] A report for the press on the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the secretary of state will provide quite a full picture of how things stand at present on the elaboration of the treaty on 50-percent cuts in nuclear weapons while maintaining the ABM Treaty, how they stand on preparations for the visit by the U.S. President to Moscow, and in other areas. I am putting the issues connected with this treaty to the fore because it is these which at the moment make up the pivot for Soviet-U.S. relations. We are moving together in the channel of political dialogue begun at the Geneva summit meeting and continued later at meetings of the leaders of the two countries in Reykjavik and Washington. As you know, this path is marked by a number of very important agreements. It has led us to the signing of the historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and it is an indication of the profound and radical changes taking place at the moment in Soviet-U.S. relations, and in international life in general.

What is even more important is the fact that we view what has thus far been achieved as one step on the ladder, from which we can make even more significant steps in the future. The talks with Mr Shultz have confirmed that both sides desire this and are confident that this can be done on the basis of the accords achieved at the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan. We have set ourselves a very difficult task but one which is realistic and attainable. We are firmly orienting ourselves toward completing the drafting of a treaty on radical cuts in strategic offensive weapons in the middle of this year. In the light of this task, the talks with the secretary of state in Moscow have provided a great deal, we think, not necessarily from the viewpoint of specific solutions to specific issues but from the viewpoint of a clear determination of the scope of the work to be done, the singling out of problems critically important for the destiny of the treaty on strategic offensive aramaments, and the establishment of a conceptual framework for finding mutually acceptable solutions. We have compared our philosophical views on the process of limitation and reduction of weapons, and we have noted, with mutual satisfaction, that today, when we are able to rely on the INF Treaty, we stand on the same platform: Sometimes we are at different ends, and I stress this, at different ends, but on the very same platform.

At the talks we determined that five or six major issues—packages, if I may put it that way—require primary attention, since they are of critical importance for the success of our entire joint undertaking. These are matters connected with the observance of and non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty; the matters of verification [kontrol] and checking [provekha] generally. These are very difficult and sensitive issues. We have reached the conclusion that there are no issues that cannot be resolved. Despite the fact that there are major and serious difficulties, they can be resolved.

Both sides put forward constructive ideas that can and must lead us to mutually acceptable solutions. Such specific proposals, which are of important significance, were put forward at the talks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the secretary of state.

I would like you to bear in mind that the secretary of state's visit to Moscow is essentially the first dialogue in a series of planned meetings leading to a final summit meeting in Moscow. I would like to inform you that, apart from problems connected with reducing strategic offensive armaments and preserving the ABM Treaty, questions on reducing conventional armaments in Europe were also discussed and examined in detail. Our approaches to a mandate for talks on conventional weapons were discussed in an objective and specific manner. Questions on concluding a convention on banning chemical weapons were also examined in a thorough manner.

An important place in our talks was taken up with the issue of human rights and the humanitarian sphere in general. I believe that, having read Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the February Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, you understand that these issues are advancing to the forefront for our society. In the foreign policy respect, they are being posed by us in a more active fashion nowadays. We are open to a constructive discussion of any issue in this important sphere. Talks with Mr Shultz on these matters were detailed and were, we consider, truly open and constructive for both sides. The secretary of state and I agreed that humanitarian issues and human rights issues will also be assigned top priority at our subsequent meetings. This was our initiative, which the U.S. side welcomed.

At talks such as these, we always discuss regional issues, but perhaps never before have they been examined by us in such depth nor have they been so businesslike and practical. Evidently one may speak of the appearance of a different quality in our discussions on these difficult and acute issues, I would even say of a new level of interest in finding a common basis for possible joint or parallel actions.

Of course, it does not follow from this that we had complete mutual understanding or complete agreement. Overall, I have to say, the talks provided a large volume

of conceptional and positional material for interpretation. As you probably know, in March there will be another meeting of ministers. We hope that at this meeting, some part of the Moscow joint blanks [zagotovka] will be converted into a real political product. In concluding my statement, I want to say that we are satisfied with the way in which the Soviet-U.S. talks passed in Moscow.

[Journalist] Lebanon, the newspaper AL-SHAB. You, as great powers, you and the United States—when do you intend to stop Israel's aggression against the civilian Arab inhabitants of Israel? Thank you.

[Shevardnadze] In my statement, I said that at the current meeting, the current talks with the secretary of state in Moscow, regional problems were examined and discussed thoroughly and fundamentally. The longest session yesterday was devoted precisely to regional problems, including a Near Eastern settlement. I cannot say that our positions have come closer because it is our principled approach, our deep conviction, that if one is to speak seriously about a Near Eastern settlement, the problem of convening a conference, an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations, has to be placed on the agenda, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council. We do not see any other resolution, real resolution, to the Near Eastern problems.

[Journalist] The weekly ZA RUBEZHOM. Was there any progress concerning the periods of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty at today's talks?

[Shevardnadze] Concerning the determination of periods of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty, in this regard we had, I would say, a substantive, interesting, constructive discussion of this matter, and we even set out our coordinated view with the U.S. delegation in a joint statement, which will be published in the press tomorrow. We have reached agreement that everything that was said in Washington, everything that was agreed, remains in force, everything regarding the ABM Treaty and correspondingly, the agreed time period.

We did not mention 10 years, or 9, or 12 years—there was no such thing. We have an accord in principle, so to speak, on not withdrawing from the treaty for the duration of an agreed period. That is not such a terrible matter. I believe we will find a solution. The main thing is that we are remaining with the Washington positions—that is the most important, the most fundamental thing.

[Journalist] Neef, GDR radio. Comrade Minister, you exchanged notes with Mr Shultz yesterday regarding fishing. In what areas of bilateral relations could further concrete accords follow, in your opinion?

[Shevardnadze] We have good prospects, in principle, from the point of view of the development and deepening of bilateral relations. First, much has been done recently. We have very serious agreements with the United States in the sphere of economic cooperation and in individual areas of scientific cooperation. A few months ago, we signed a very important agreement on peaceful cooperation in space: That means approximately 16 very important global programs. Negotiations are now being conducted on transportation and on some other areas. Good prospects are opening up in the sphere of trade and on a broad plane in economic cooperation.

[Journalist, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] THE LOS ANGELES TIMES. Maybe it is too early to ask, but do you have some sort of idea regarding when the summit meeting could take place? If you do not have any now, when will you be able to set a date for the summit meeting?

[Shevardnadze] We have discussed it, approximately, so to speak. It will be either the end of May or the first half of June. As for the date, we will probably agree upon it finally at the next meeting. But I guarantee the visit will take place.

PRAVDA Reports News Conference

PM241225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] On 22 February E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, gave a press conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. Addressing Soviet and foreign journalists, he said:

You are already quite well-informed about the course of U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz' talks in Moscow.

The press release on CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with him provides quite a full picture of how matters now stand as regards the elaboration of a treaty on 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive arms within the framework of the preservation of the ABM Treaty and as regards the preparation of the U.S. President's visit to Moscow.

I am putting these issues first because they now constitute the linchpin of Soviet-U.S. relations. We are moving together in the channel of the political dialogue begun by the Geneva summit and continued at the meetings between the two countries' leaders in Reykjavik and Washington.

As you know, this path has been marked by a number of very important agreements and accords. It led us to the signing of the historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. That is a truly great milestone in relations between the Soviet

Union and the United States. The treaty reflects more than the coincidence of the sides' approaches on admittedly only one question, but one of extreme importance for the destiny of mankind. It is an indicator of the profound, radical changes taking place now in Soviet-U.S. relations and in international life in general. Even more important is the fact that we view what has been achieved so far as a rung from which we can take even more important steps into the future.

The talks with G. Shultz confirmed that both sides want this and are confident that it can be done on the basis of the accords reached at M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with President Reagan.

We and the U.S. side have a clear awareness that we have set ourselves a very difficult task, but one which is realistic and feasible. We firmly intend to elaborate a treaty on radical reductions in strategic offensive arms by the middle of this year.

In the light of this task the talks with the secretary of state in Moscow were very productive, we believe. Not necessarily in terms of specific solutions of specific questions, but from the viewpoint of clearly defining the scale of the upcoming work, highlighting problems of critical importance to the fate of the strategic offensive weapons treaty, and establishing the conceptual framework for finding mutually acceptable solutions.

We compared our philosophical views of the process of arms limitation and reduction and noted with mutual satisfaction that today, now that we can rely on the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, we stand on one platform, at different ends perhaps, but on the same platform. I have in mind primarily the Washington accords on 50-percent reductions of strategic offensive arms and the observance of the ABM Treaty signed in 1972.

We proceed from the need to solve the problems associated with the new strategic offensive weapons treaty dynamically [v dinamike], in a context of developing trust, predictability, and openness.

At the talks we determined that there are five or six "sets" of problems [problem-"blokov"] that require primary attention since they are of critical importance to the success of our whole joint enterprise.

These are:

—issues connected with compliance with the ABM Treaty and nonwithdrawal from it;

—problems of verification and monitoring in general;

—long-range sea-launched cruise missiles;

—issues connected with air-launched cruise missiles;

—mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles;

—the structure and configuration of the strategic arms left after the reductions.

The exchange of opinions gave us a more precise idea of the nature and essence of our divergences. The most important point is that after a sober and considered assessment of the situation with regard to each of these sets of problems, we reached the conclusion that there are no insoluble issues, there are many difficulties, but there are no insurmountable problems.

Constructive ideas that can and must bring us to mutually acceptable solutions were put forward on both sides.

M.S. Gorbachev put forward specific and very important proposals in conversation with the secretary of state. Our delegations and experts will have to conduct vigorous talks in the light of the proposals put forward at the Moscow meetings.

I would ask you to remember that the secretary of state's visit to Moscow is essentially the first in a series of planned meetings this year leading to a summit meeting in Moscow.

I would also like to inform you that, in addition to problems linked with the reduction of strategic offensive arms and the preservation of the ABM Treaty, issues connected with reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe were discussed and examined in detail. Our approaches toward elaborating the mandate for talks on this problem were discussed in a specific and concrete manner. Issues connected with the conclusion of a convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons were also thoroughly examined.

The question of human rights and the humanitarian sphere in general occupied an important place in our conversations.

I think that, having seen M.S. Gorbachev's report to the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, you realize that these questions are coming to the fore for our society and that we are raising them more vigorously today in the foreign policy context.

"Socialism," M.S. Gorbachev said, "is a society of social guarantees that does not leave man to face the difficulties and adversities of life alone." So we naturally cannot help being concerned about the degree of social protection of people, especially in countries which, together with us, have assumed certain commitments in this regard under the terms of international agreements.

Developing the processes of democratization and glasnost, placing the emphasis on self-management and on involving working people in the management of all aspects of the people's life, and displaying a critical

attitude ourselves to certain aspects of prevailing practice in our country in the sphere of the solution of humanitarian problems, we are open to constructive discussion of any important problem in this sphere.

The discussion with G. Shultz on these questions was detailed and, so we believe, open and mutually constructive.

We agreed with the secretary of state that humanitarian problems and human rights issues will be given a high priority at our subsequent meetings too. This was our initiative and was welcomed by the U.S. side.

At such talks we always discuss regional problems. But they have perhaps never before been examined in such depth and never before possessed such a businesslike and practical thrust. It is evidently possible to speak of the appearence of a different quality in our discussions of the complex and acute problems, and of a different level of interest in finding a common basis for possible joint or parallel actions.

It does not, of course, follow from this there was complete mutual understanding and complete agreement [polnoye soglasiye] between us. The positions of our countries and their approaches to the settlement of any particular conflict situation are well-known and there are few places where they coincide. This has to be stated with the utmost frankness.

But as a result of the exchange of opinions between our leaders in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington, and during our other contacts, a realization has emerged and is gradually, stage by stage being affirmed, that not just a comparison of each other's positions must be placed at the focus of the discussions, but also an analysis of specific realities, specific situations, and a comparison of our mutual visualizations of these realities.

This, as we have agreed, is a promising, a very promising, and responsible approach.

On the whole the talks have provided a large volume of conceptual and positional material for interpretation.

As you surely know, the next meeting of foreign ministers of the USSR and United States will take place in March. We hope that at that meeting some proportion of the joint Moscow blanks [zagotovki] will be transformed into a real political finished product.

In concluding my statement, I want to say that we are pleased with how the Soviet-American talks have proceeded in Moscow.

E.A. Shevardnadze answered journalists' questions.

Question: How would you comment on the unusual optimism which the U.S. secretary of state has just voiced with regard to the settlement of the Afghan conflict?

Answer: Any conflict, any issue has its own priorities. When we speak of the Afghan settlement, we also define priorities. These are the Geneva process, the Geneva talks between the Governments of Pakistan and Afghanistan with the mediation of the UN deputy secretary general.

The three main documents at these talks have already been agreed upon. As for the fourth—concerning the time schedule for the withdrawal of the Soviet troops—here too we have complete clarity since the Statement on Afghanistan by M.S. Gorbachev. There is every reason for presupposing that the forthcoming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks which begin 2 March will be the concluding round.

As for the questions of forming a coalition government, this problem will, as follows from M.S. Gorbachev's Statement, be resolved by the Afghans themselves. Such a government can be formed neither in Moscow nor in Washington, nor in Islamabad. This must be decided by the Afghan people themselves.

Question: Was the question of convening in Moscow an international conference on humanitarian questions broached during the talks?

Answer: Yes, it was intimated although not in any very great detail. The question itself is being discussed at the Vienna meeting of participating states of the all-European process. This Soviet proposal is being discussed there, and also the French and British proposal on holding conferences on the territories of their own countries. We have spoken out to the effect that these proposals need not be set against each other. I, for instance, believe that humanitarian problems are a most extensive sphere, one might say a global sphere. Therefore there is enough material for discussion for conferences not only in London and Paris, but also in Moscow. Given goodwill, it is possible to find mutually acceptable solutions.

Question: How do the great powers—the United States and the USSR—intend to halt Israel's aggression against the peaceful Arab inhabitants of Israel?

Answer: During the latest talks with the secretary of state in Moscow we devoted a significant part of the more than 20 hours of conversation to regional problems. We also had a substantial discussion on the Near East settlement. I cannot say that our positions were brought any closer together. The point is that, if a Near East settlement is to be seriously discussed, the agenda must contain the problem of convening an international conference under UN auspices to be attended by the five permanent members of the Security Council. We see no

other way to achieve a real solution. The secretary of state briefed us on his plans to tour the Near East. Now it is difficult to forecast the results of this mission. I must admit that the very concept by which the U.S. Administration is guided on questions of a Near East settlement generates doubts everywhere. Our principled approach toward the solution of the Near East problem is shared by all Arab countries, the Palestinian movement, Palestinian organizations, the European Communities, and the overwhelming majority of other states. I think that we must pool our efforts to speed up preparations for such a conference. And the faster we are in finding a solution here, the sooner will we solve the problem of ending the bloodshed in the Near East.

Question: Mr Minister, as you know, a draft resolution is now being distributed among Security Council members on the question of the Persian Gulf and the sanctions which ought to be implemented against Iran. As a result of your talks in Moscow, was there any success in bringing the U.S. and Soviet governments closer to pooling their efforts for the sake of cooperation in ending the Iran-Iraq war?

Answer: The resolution adopted by the Security Council for the purpose of ending the Iran-iraq conflict is the result of collective labor by the Security Council members. I think that subsequent steps will also be determined by collective labor and collective efforts by the permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council. This serious work is now under way. A draft submitted by Britain is being examined. Our representatives seriously criticize it for certain flaws. I cannot rule out that other council members could introduce their own alternative resolutions. But the main point is that painstaking and active work is already being done in the Security Council to determine the next steps. What the outcome will be, whether it will be a resolution on embargo or some other documents—this is a matter for the future.

Question: An uprising is in progress in the occupied Palestinian lands in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, and, finally, on the Golan Heights. Some 3 weeks ago, replying to a question by our correspondent, Shultz noted that he has no reports on what is happening there. State Department Spokesman Redman also replied yesterday that he had no information on what is happening in the occupied lands. How does Moscow view this uprising, and what is your reaction to Israel's repression against the civilian population?

Answer: During the conversation I did not get the impression that the secretary of state was not up to date on what is happening on Palestinian soil. We all know perfectly well what is happening there. I think that you are familiar with the Soviet Union's stance on this account. We condemn the repressive measures implemented by the Israeli Government against Palestinians. We advocate the soonest possible solution of this question. We insist that the convening of the international conference be speeded up, because any interim or provisional measures would hardly be of help. There is a need for serious intervention by the entire world community.

Question: Secretary of State Shultz spoke of three documents whose drafts ought to be worked out at the Geneva talks in time for your next meeting. Could you comment on the nature of these documents and, in this context, has there been any progress in the matter of setting a time limit for nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty?

Answer: It is impossible to comment on these documents now, since they are not yet ready. We agreed that these drafts will be submitted at the Geneva talks in a few days' time and that a thorough discussion of them will begin. The secretary of state and I have instructed our delegations to study them substantively and to submit their specific conclusions in time for the next meeting of foreign ministers in Washington.

As regards agreement on the time limit for nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty, we had a substantive and constructive discussion on this question. The U.S. delegation and we outlined our common opinion in the joint statement which will be published in the press. We reached agreement that everything which was said in Washington remains in force. We did not identify any specific time limits of 9, 10, or 12 years there. We have agreement in principle not to withdraw from the treaty during the agreed time period. We will be able to agree on the final duration of this time limit. The main point is that the sides maintain the positions of the Washington accords.

Question: Both sides have described the Moscow talks as useful and positive. It does seem, however, that the same differences still remain—the Near East, the situation in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan. Could you give some specific examples of issues on which the sides came closer to accord?

Answer: Our positions came closer on some issues, while more clarity was introduced on others. When I spoke of positions coming closer together, I did not mean the regional problems. It was more the sphere of arms limitation and reduction. In my statement I even listed specifically the questions which were discussed successfully enough in the disarmament sphere. This applies to the future treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons in conditions of observance of the ABM Treaty. It also applies to sea-launched cruise missiles, air-launched cruise missiles, mobile ICBM's, and several others. Certain trends toward progress have really emerged on these issues.

Question: The USSR has announced a timetable for the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan. Has the U.S. side announced a specific timetable for the ending of military aid to the armed opposition?

Answer: I have already said that the main documents have been agreed at the Geneva talks. If they are taken as guidance, all interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs should end. The United States and the Soviet Union are guarantors in this regard. I believe that this says a lot about the U.S. commitments. This applies to weapons supplies and all other aspects.

Question: Secretary of State Shultz has said that he hopes or expects that the Soviet troops will leave Afghanistan by the end of 1988. Does this mean that the U.S. side has asked that the timetable proposed by M.S. Gorbachev be shortened somewhat so as to facilitate the withdrawal of the Soviet troops by the end of this year?

Answer: When the Geneva process ends, a detailed timetable for the Soviet troops' withdrawal will be announced accordingly.

You know that M.S. Gorbachev set a 10-month timetable, which suits the Afghan leadership. In principle the question of the troop withdrawal timetable is a subject for Soviet-Afghan talks.

Question: In your opinion, in what areas of Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations could there be further specific [konkretnyye] accords?

Answer: In principle we have good prospects here. Quite a lot has actually been achieved recently. We have significant agreements with the United States on certain areas in the sphere of economic ties and scientific contacts. A few months ago we signed an important agreement on peaceful cooperation in space covering 16 major joint projects. Talks are now under way on the conclusion of an agreement in transport, science and technology, and some other areas. Definite prospects are appearing in the trade sphere.

Question: G. Shultz has said that certain elements of confusion [nedoponimaniye] have been cleared up with regard to the reduction of strategic armaments and the ABM Treaty. What specific misunderstandings [neponimaniye] did he have in mind?

Answer: The main difficulty at the Geneva talks was that the U.S. delegation, judging by its behavior, gave the clear impression that it had deviated from the accords reached at summit level in Washington. In Moscow the secretary of state and I cleared up a lot, the main point being that we agreed to be guided by the principles regarding the observance of and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty which were agreed by the USSR and U.S. leaders.

Question: Returning to the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, how do you rate the chances of completing the elaboration of a treaty by the time of the Moscow summit? Are the chances definite, serious, or good?

Answer: They are real chances.

Question: In the past the Soviet Union has accused the United States of hindering the settlement of the conflict in Afghanistan. How about now?

Answer: The secretary of state has stated that the United States intends to promote the conclusion of the Geneva process.

Question: Could you not describe in more detail the precise questions which arouse the Soviet Union's concern regarding the human rights situation in the United States?

Answer: If I were to begin listing everything now it would go on a very long time. I shall be brief. We are concerned about the increasing problem of the homeless in the United States and the problem of discrimination against the indigenous population—the Indians. Specific facts, figures, and names have been cited. Then there are questions relating to social and economic inequality. In particular we spoke about the fact that men and women are not paid the same for their work when they do identical jobs, and we cited statistics. We spoke about the fact that many people who take part in the antiwar movement or in demonstrations in the United States are unlawfully imprisoned for their beliefs. Facts were also cited. Many former active Nazis who have still not been punished for their crimes are living in the United States, as the administration knows. We spoke about this and many other matters and will do so again. So long as problems exist they must be discussed and solutions sought.

Question: Perhaps it is too soon to ask this question, but is there any idea of when the summit will take place?

Answer: For the moment I can say approximately—at the end of May or the first half of June. As for a specific date, we will probably reach a final agreement at the next meeting of ministers, which will be in Washington.

Answers were given to other questions.

Further on Shultz Moscow News Conference

PM241119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Meeting With Journalists"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz held a news conference on 22 February at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. Addressing Soviet and foreign journalists, he said: We have had exceptionally intensive talks during my 2 days' stay in Moscow. I shall try to generalize the results of our work.

As a whole they are positive. We failed to make headway on all questions, but with regard to the majority we succeeded in making progress. On the whole, I believe that we can make a good evaluation of our 2 days of work.

We succeeded in revealing certain very important avenues which would bring closer President Reagan's visit to Moscow and a summit meeting.

My first meeting with Minister Shevardnadze was devoted to the human rights issue. U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Schifter spent a long time discussing the same subject with Soviet counterparts.

The discussions were of a wide-ranging nature, which was satisfying for us. Schifter also met with his counterparts in the Foreign Ministry and representatives of the MVD and the Central Committee Secretariat. We consider it important to meet directly with the people engaged in particular questions of concern to us. We also received several useful points of clarification, in particular regarding the exit or emigration policy. I am pleased that Minister Shevardnadze confirmed once more absolutely categorically that the only obstacle on the path to emigration is connected with people's past work with state secrets.

We also agreed to hold a number of meetings between Soviet and U.S. specialists on the human rights issue and this was the result of the proposals submitted by the Soviet side when First Deputy Secretary of State Whitehead was here. We agreed at the time that a conference of Soviet and U.S. representatives on the question of emigration and humanitarian issues would be held with the participation of U.S. and Soviet specialists on questions of psychiatry and other problems relating to this field. We also agreed to hold the first meeting on human rights issues on a regular basis.

Of course, the Soviet side had its own agenda. On this score its representatives set forth their views on what seem to them to be shortcomings on the U.S. side.

We had very substantial [sushchestvennyye] and important discussions on the question of strategic arms both with the USSR foreign minister and within the framework of our working group.

This topic was also a subject of debate during my long talk with General Secretary Gorbachev.

As a result of the coincidence of views on verification problems, we succeeded in putting into operation that which is essential for drafting a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments and its preparation before the Moscow summit.

We succeeded in agreeing to give instructions to the delegations in Geneva on preparing three important documents before March, when the foreign ministers will meet. First, there is a joint draft protocol on inspections. Second, there is a draft protocol on reequipping and eliminating strategic offensive armaments. And the third document is a draft memorandum on mutual understanding, which will be a component of the strategic offensive armaments treaty. This memorandum will be similar to the one included in the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, with regard to which information should be supplied on a broad basis.

In our opinion it is exceptionally important to set to work on these questions as soon as possible. This is necessary to devote the necessary amount of time to them, because problems of verification and strategic armaments will be far more complex than questions connected with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. And it is necessary to effect an exchange of relevant data as soon as possible to understand fully the nature of the actual problem of verification.

The Soviet side adheres to a similar opinion on this score. We also succeeded in making headway on several other aspects concerning the drafting of a strategic offensive armaments treaty. That is why we regard the meetings as excellent.

We also discussed questions concerning space defense and the ABM Treaty. Both aspects are in need of the drafting of a relevant document. For our part, we believe that its drafting should be carried out parallel to the drafting of a strategic offensive armaments treaty. We had a thorough discussion of this question in Washington and continued the discussion here in Moscow. Those taking part in the talks should, in accordance with our instructions, elaborate an agreement which will be based on a joint statement. I think we succeeded in eliminating some misunderstandings here, although you cannot say that of all problems. Nonetheless, we succeeded in making headway.

We had a thorough discussion of the nuclear tests problem. As is well-known, this is an area where we have made headway. We have now agreed to coordinate a relevant protocol to the test ban treaty and the treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions. We have issued instructions to our delegations to prepare all this for March, when the ministers' meeting will take place. If we succeed in achieving this, we will have all the lacking elements which will enable us to make headway and reach agreement on the ratification of these documents, which we have long been seeking.

We had a thorough discussion, within the working group, at minister level, and with Mr Gorbachev, of questions of chemical armaments. Both sides want to achieve a ban on chemical armaments and to resolve the verification problems connected with this. We want to do everything necessary to ensure that our treaty meets with broad support and that as many states at possible accede to it, or at any rate all states with chemical weapons.

We also had an exchange of opinions on questions of conventional armaments and stability in the conventional arms field. We believe that this will have a positive effect on the progress of the Vienna talks.

Useful discussions were also held on bilateral relations. As you know, we signed an agreement, or rather exchanged notes, on fishing, which is a positive factor. This time, during our meetings we devoted a larger number of hours than usual to regional problems—at the minister level and during my talk with the general secretary. I think we have never before had such full discussions.

We had quite thorough discussions on the questions of Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, and the peace process in the Near East, in South Africa, Central America, and the Korean peninsula. So you can now understand why we worked until midnight yesterday. These questions are difficult and I would say that we have succeeded in bringing clarity to some of them. Perhaps we have even succeeded in laying the foundation for positive headway on other questions. That is why as a whole I would describe these discussions as valuable. We will see how the results of our discussion affect the Geneva meetings.

G. Shultz then answered journalists' questions.

Biryukov Views Work Ahead for Soviet, U.S.

LD231634 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 23 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov reports:

This morning, a Soviet plane with Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze and his party aboard took off from the Vnukovo airport and headed for Prague. Also this morning, an American plane with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and his party aboard took off from the Sheremetyevo airport and headed for Brussels. After a two-day active Soviet-American dialogue in Moscow which, in the appraisal of both sides, was marked with a certain headway, the heads of the foreign policy departments of the USSR and the USA went to their allies to inform them of the main aspect of the February meeting in Moscow.

Representatives of the Warsaw treaty and NATO countries will specifically learn that Eduard Shevardnadze is to visit Washington on March 22 and 23, where it is planned to set the date and the final programme of the Soviet-American summit meeting. They will also learn that perhaps the main result of the foreign ministers' meeting, which ended in Moscow, is the continuity in the policy of the USSR and the USA toward each other, which takes its beginning from Geneva and builds up energy through Reykjavik and Washington for the meeting in Moscow where it is planned to sign a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive armaments with full compliance with the ABM Treaty the way it was signed in 1972.

But towards conclusion of that treaty the sides are to do a huge volume of work. Here is the problem of control which is much more difficult to resolve than in signing the Washington Treaty on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. Here is the question of ratification of the treaty which laid the beginning to the era of nuclear missile disarmament. Here are difficulties on the road toward signing a convention on prohibition of chemical weapons, linked with launching the production of binary ammunition in the United States. Here is the need for attaining understanding on the problem of settlement of numerous regional conflicts which are now shaking the world—the USSR and the USA should show to the whole world to see an example of interaction in this sphere of international life on the basis of the balance of the interests of all sides concerned without exception.

The USSR and the USA are to bear huge responsibility since the concept of confrontation prevailed over their relations over the past 45 years, and now they ought to bring into effect their international responsibility for the destinies of mankind on the basis of the quest for coincidence of interests.

Shultz Post-Moscow Brussels News Conference

LD232301 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1607 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Brussels, 23 Feb (TASS)—TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports: A session of the NATO Council was held here today at the foreign minister level. It was convened in order to hear G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, speak on the results of his talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow.

Speaking at a news conference at the end of the session, G. Shultz said that the "exchange of views with the allies was useful and necessary." In his words, it was devoted to "questions discussed in Moscow, and also questions connected with the session of the NATO council to be held here in a week at the level of heads of state and governments." "I consider," G. Shultz added, "that it is always useful for us to put our heads together, not only concerning the meaning of NATO and its strategy, but also concerning how to achieve progress in relations between East and West."

Concerning the state of affairs at the Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic offensive weapons (SOW), the U.S. secretary of state noted: "We achieved discernible progress on these weapons at the Washington summit between President R. Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Work is going full speed

ahead in Geneva. I consider that useful progress was also attained in Moscow yesterday, although noted the necessity to conclude a good agreement to reduce SOW."

The head of the U.S. foreign policy department noted in particular that at the Moscow talks much attention was given to questions of the verification of the implementation of the points of the future Sow treaty, which which was borne out by the instruction given by the ministers of both countries to their representatives in Geneva to prepare for E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Washington in March of this year draft protocols concerning inspection.

In G. Shultz's answers to other questions from correspondents it was evident that there have not yet been any positive changes in the U.S. position regarding the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program. The statements of the U.S. secretary of state confirmed the reports in the local press of the intention of Washington and its main West European allies to push through at the coming summit meeting here of leaders of NATO countries 2-3 March a decision on updating NATO's nuclear arsenals, which will be maintained after the implementation of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

On the question of a settlement around Afghanistan, G. Shultz said, among other things, that he was convinced of the sincerity of the Soviet leadership's intention to keep strictly to the spirit and letter of M.S. Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan. "The Soviet leaders' statements on Afghanistan," G. Shultz noted, "are extremely precise, clear, unambiguous, and impartial. Of course, everything now depends on the possibility of achieving an agreement at the Geneva talks...."

Replying to a question regarding the prospects of his coming trip to the Middle East, the U.S. secretary of state that his mission "will be difficult," that he has "small chances of finding a settlement" to the conflict, "but it is worth trying. For this it is essential to arm oneself with patience."

U.S. Reaction to Shultz Moscow Talks Noted

LD231639 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 23 TASS—U.S. State Secretary George Shultz informed President Reagan on the results of his talks in Moscow calling them productive and useful, said White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater. He noted that the secretary intended to inform U.S. NATO allies, before his return to Washington, of the results of his meetings with representatives of the Soviet leadership. The sides reached progress on most themes under discussion, the ABC TV company quotes Shultz's pronouncement at the end of the talks.

U.S. analysts point out that the discussion of issues pertaining to the prospects for concluding of a treaty on cutting strategic nuclear arsenals was one of the most important themes of the Moscow talks. The CBS TV company points out in this connection that Shultz said that the two days of negotiations gave a new impetus to drafting an agreement on cutting strategic weapons by the time of holding a new Soviet-American summit.

In its turn, the newspaper "WASHINGTON POST" writes that reaching an agreement on drafting three detailed documents by the time of talks in Washington between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. State Secretary George Shultz (planned for the next month) became the main item of the talks on strategic weapons. U.S. officials positively assessed this as necessary and important evidence of the determination of the two sides to pursue a solution of this question at an early stage of the talks, but at the same time they admitted that there is no guarantee of reaching an agreement on these complicated and delicate questions. The newspaper writes that, though there were no announcements of major triumphs or a considerable progress, there were no signs either of roadblocks in the way of holding a Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

The Afghan problem is another item on the agenda of Moscow meetings of Shultz to which the U.S. media gives increased attention. Newspapers and TV stations point out in their comments that the Soviet Union shows a sincere desire for its earliest solution. "THE WASHINGTON POST" points out that Shultz told journalists that he had no doubts whatsoever that the USSR wanted a withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan. The state secretary said at a press conference in Moscow, points out the newspaper "NEW YORK TIMES", that the United States and the Soviet Union reached a common opinion, on the whole, on conditions of ending the war in Afghanistan, but complicated and tense talks will be needed to complete work on a peace agreement.

Reagan Remarks on European Armament Noted

LD232047 Moscow TASS in English 2028 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 23 TASS—President Reagan has made a speech over the satellite channels of USIA Worldnet in view of the coming meeting of the NATO heads of state and government. He called for consolidation of the military bloc, for continued policy from the position of strength towards the Soviet Union and other Warsaw treaty member-countries. Meanwhile, the U.S. President underlined that an important part of the NATO strategy should be continuation of negotiations with the Soviet Union on questions of control over armaments, which have already led to the signing by the leaders of the USSR and the USA of the intermediate nuclear forces agreement. "That agreement represented a step towards world peace", Reagan said.

At the same time President Reagan recalled that on the territory of West European countries there are about 4,000 American tactical nuclear weapons. He described those weapons as "a strong link" between the United

States and Western Europe, and a guarantee of peace. The U.S. President made it clear that the administration did not intend to heed the demands made in West European countries for mutual reduction of tactical nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United Statess. "We must make sure that all of our forces for peace—including our nuclear forces—remain modern and effective". Reagan reaffirmed the U.S. intention to modernise its nuclear tactical armaments in Europe and said that to maintain them at a proper level of efficiency "requires constant work".

"We want a safer world, one with smaller forces and fewer weapons" and "that is the goal of the strategic arms reduction talks under way now in Geneva—a 50 per cent reduction in the strategic arsenals of both the United States and the Soviet Union", Reagan said. At the same time he reaffirmed the determination of the United States to continue speeding up the star wars programme and did not say a word about the vital need for unswerving compliance with the letter and spirit of the ABM Treaty to have an agreement on reduction of strategic armaments attained.

More on Reagan Remarks

PM241137 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Feb 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Speech by R. Reagan"]

[Text] Washington, 23 Feb—U.S. President Reagan has spoken on the USIA international television system Worldnet about the upcoming NATO Council session at the level of heads of state and government. He stressed that an important part of NATO's strategy must be to continue the talks with the Soviet Union on questions of arms control, which have already led to the signing by the USSR and U.S. leaders of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. "This treaty," Reagan said, "represents a step toward the strengthening of peace."

"We are working for a safer world, a world with fewer armed forces and armaments," Reagan continued. "That is the aim of the talks currently being held in Geneva on the 50-percent reduction of the strategic arsenals of both the United States and the Soviet Union."

At the same time, the U.S. President called for a strengthening of the NATO bloc and a continuation of the "position of strength policy" with regard to the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states. The Atlantic alliance, Reagan stated, is "the basis of U.S. foreign policy and American security." He pointed out here that more than 300,000 U.S. servicemen and around 4,000 U.S. tactical nuclear weapons remain on the territory of the West European countries. Furthermore, Reagan confirmed the U.S. intention to modernize its tactical nuclear arms in Europe. "We must ensure," he said, "that our armed forces, including the nuclear forces, are modern and effective." The U.S. President also declared America's determination to continue accelerating the development of the "Star Wars" program.

U.S. Allocates More Funds for 'Secret Projects'

I D240957 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 24 TASS—A considerable increase in the Pentagon's secret spendings is provided in the draft military budget of the USA tabled by the Reagan administration in the U.S. Congress. The newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER quotes the returns of the analysis carried out by independent researchers. According to the findings of the research, the newspaper notes, the appropriations on secret projects of the U.S. Defense Department are to grow almost by a third to reach 35 billion dollars in the next fiscal year. This clandestine budget of the U.S. Defense Department, which has more than trebled during the years of the Reagan administration, is used by the Pentagon top brass to develop top secret weapons and finance secret military projects, among them, in particular, programs for the manufacture of robots for combat operations in the eventuality of the use of nuclear weapons, providing task force units with the latest equipment and "financing subversive operations by anti-communist elements the world over", the newspaper said.

Portugal's Cavaco Silva in U.S. To Discuss Aid

LD240718 Moscow TASS in English 0708 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 24 TASS—Portuguese Prime Minister Anibal Cavaco Silva arrived in Washington on Tuesday night. The current visit is the first ever official visit of the Portuguese premier to the USA. Today he is to meet with President Reagan, hold talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Defense Carlucci and the leaders of the U.S. Congress.

Judging by the pronouncements of high-ranking officials of the Washington Administration the talks will centre on U.S. military and economic aid to Portugal and the U.S. military bases. Lisbon has recently expressed discontent with Washington's actual abandonment of the agreement reached at the talks in 1983 on prolonging the U.S.-Portuguese agreement on the military bases and sharply reduced the volume of aid to Portugal.

More than 4,000 American soldiers are stationed in the U.S. Airforce Base in Lajes in the Azores. It is a big base of the U.S. anti-submarine aircraft, an important strategic point for the refuelling of American aircraft on their way across the Atlantic.

The talks will also cover the situation in the "Common Market" and in southern Africa.

On Thursday, February 25, the Portuguese prime minister will leave Washington.

UN To Consider U.S. Closing of PLO Office

LD240000 Moscow TASS in English 2244 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 23 TASS—Meeting the request of a group of Arab countries, the U.N. General Assembly is resuming its 42nd session on February 29 to study the U.S. Government's unlawful and arbitrary intention to close the mission of the PLO Permanent Observer at the United Nations, which is regarded here as a gross violation of the U.S. commitments to United Nations.

The agreement to this effect had been reached as a result of consultations held at the U.N. headquarters. This was officially announced here today.

The planned action by the United States is contradicting the agreement between the United Nations and the U.S. Government on the location of U.N. central agencies.

Since PLO's representatives have the status of U.N. observers, the United States should create all conditions for their unimpeded work in accordance with a decision of the U.N. General Assembly.

Peace Committee Head on Dartmouth Conference

LD192152 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 19 TASS—The meetings within the framework of the Dartmouth Conference are a good opportunity for personal contacts and frank discussions between politologists, economists, newsmen and business operators of the USSR and the USA, said Genrikh Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee. On these days meetings of the working group of the Dartmouth Conference on political relations are in session in the building of the Soviet Peace Committee. It is discussing questions pertaining to prospects of Soviet-American relations, their role and significance in the world today.

In the course of such meetings their participants strive to understand and discuss each other's stands, exchange views on different questions, Genrikh Borovik said in an interview with TASS correspondent Mikhail Svetlichnyy. The Dartmouth process is extremely useful, since it makes it possible to realise how important it is for us to meet with each other.

The current stage in the Soviet-American relation is characterised by their improvement. Yet it would be premature to speak about a radical change. To achieve it it is necessary to work not only at the government but also at the public level. The recent meeting in the USA of Soviet and American public, or as the Americans themselves describe it—the Soviet-American summit level public meeting—is striking proof of that.

Numerous proposals on joint projects were expressed. Today there are nearly 500 quite specific joint Soviet-American projects, one hundred of them being absolutely realistic already now. Their range is quite broad from the co-production of a musical adapted from Aristophanes comedy Lysistrata, in which wives boycott their husbands to end the war, down to setting up a joint venture for the manufacture of T-shirts with Soviet-American peace symbols. Among the proposals is the project of a joint Soviet-American space flight. After the visit to the U.S. Congress, Soviet and American citizens even expressed in Senate the proposal that a meeting of the Senate committee be addressed by a Soviet scientist and cosmonaut as an expert.

There is an interesting idea to hold a "round-table" of American and Soviet soldiers in which we were promised support at the USSR Defence Ministry, but have not yet received a response from the Pentagon. The prospects for starting a joint Soviet-American magazine, for a course of lectures on the Soviet Union at American universities and many others look quite attainable. To promote these projects we are planning to set up a Soviet-American Council on Joint Projects including 12 members from each side. All these projects have been put into a computer bank. The council will be an organization running on a cost-accounting basis and will ensure contacts between firms and plants [words indistinct] and charge for that commission pay.

All that, in my view, is specific consolidation of that "outburst" of the human liking for the Soviet Union which is happening in America now. It seems to me that this is a specific manifestation of new thinking, which is entering our relations not only from above, but also at the grass roots, with the assistance of common people, Genrikh Borovik said. This new thinking is characterised by the mutual wish for putting an end to the endless hostile rhetoric, accusations levelled against one another and the senseless arms race. This wish has now prevailed among the mass of the people.

Dartmouth Meeting Ends

LD201904 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 20 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—The meeting of the working group of the Dartmouth conference on political relations has closed here today. In the course of the three-day meeting its participants discussed the role and significance of Soviet-American relations in the world today, exchanged views on how the internal processes taking place in the American-Soviet society now influence the prospects for the development of these relations.

The history of contacts within the framework of the Dartmouth process between political figures, scientists, journalists, politologists and representatives of business circles from the USSR and the USA dates back to October 1960. Since then such meetings have been held regularly, including in the years that were difficult for Soviet-American relations. Now, in the opinion of the participants in the meeting, certain positive trends towards an improvement of relations between the two countries have outlined, and the role of such contacts has further grown.

At the meeting of the working group on political relations we could understand better what changes are taking place in your country, Nancy Johnson, member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the Republican Party (Connecticut state), said in an interview with TASS Correspondent Mikhail Svetlichniy. We could convince ourselves how the process of openness has developed and in what direction it is proceeding. The broadening process of democratisation in the Soviet Union is a source of much interest for us.

The American people no longer feel deeply suspicious and hostile to the USSR, as was the case a mere ten years ago. Many Americans visit the Soviet Union and the East European countries to find out for themselves whether we can make friends. It is particularly important from the viewpoint of the future that despite the different interests of our great powers we can also determine the points of contact and develop cooperation where our positions are similar. I have succeeded in discussing a number of issues in connection with economic projects and exchanges between people.

I believe, the congressman said, that our discussions within the framework of the Dartmouth process are highly fruitful, and I hope that in the future ever more common citizens of the USSR and the USA would be involved in contacts of this kind. We need the broadest possible dialogue. The participation in the current session has been to me an excellent opportunity to get an insight into the processes taking place in the USSR currently, which will help me to explain these processes to the Americans.

U.S. Navy Secretary Resigns Over Budget

LD230145 Moscow TASS in English 2340 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 23 TASS—On Monday James Webb, U.S. secretary of the Navy, tendered his resignation from the post which he has been filling since April 1987.

In a letter of resignation sent to President Reagan, Webb did not conceal that his resignation was prompted by a serious dispute with the now U.S. Secretary of Defence Frank Carlucci over the question of a cut in naval budget. Expenditures for naval needs, according to the plans for the 1989 fiscal year, are to be slashed by 12,000 million dollars.

Particular exasperation of Webb was caused by the fact that the Pentagon chief rejected the plans suggested by Webb for cuts which would envisage an increase in the number of naval ships up to 600 by 1989.

The Pentagon, under the pressure of the Congress which looks for ways to reduce the huge deficit of the federal budget, had reluctantly to agree to limiting the excessive expenditures for its needs and to postpone till 1992 the implementation of plans for an increase in the number of naval ships.

"I am unable to support him (Carlucci) personally or to defend this amended budget", Webb stated in the letter to the U.S. President.

Webb's resignation will take effect as soon as it is accepted by Reagan.

Weinberger to President's Intelligence Board

LD230731 Moscow TASS in English 0646 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 23 TASS—On Monday the White House announced the appointment of Caspar Weinberger, former U.S. secretary of defense, as member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Weinberger resigned late last year. Officially his decision to resign on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting and the signing of the INF Treaty was explained by causes of a "personal character". The press yet pointed out that Weinberger expressed dissatisfaction with the Soviet-American agreements on a cut in nuclear weapons, which are being planned, and had sharp differences in the field of arms control with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

TASS Notes South Dakota Primary Results

LD240952 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] New York February 24 TASS—Robert Dole, Republican minority leader in U.S. Senate, and Democrat Congressman Richard Gephardt have won the South Dakota primaries within the framework of the presidential election campaign in the United States. According to preliminary returns, Dole won more than 50 percent of votes of the local Republican electorate, thus leaving his runners-up far behind. The senator's easily won victory is explained in a large measure by the fact that his main rival U.S. Vice-President George Bush had given up the competition in South Dakota.

The fight among the Democrats was even tougher, yet according to incomplete data Gephardt managed to outdo Michael Dukakis, the governor of Massachussetts state, by roughly 20 per cent.

South Dakota sends only 19 delegates for the national Democratic Party convention and 18 delegates—for the Republican convention. Yet no small significance is assigned here to the returns of the primaries. The point is that the strength of the participants in the presidential race is put to test in such competitions and their outcome leaves its impact on the sentiments among the electorate in other states.

U.S. Presidential Hopeful Dukakis Profiled

PM241101 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Feb 88 Single Edition p 5

[Article by A. Bogomolov under the rubric "The United States: Who Will Make It to the White House": "John Kennedy's Heir? Michael Dukakis Shoots Ahead Among the Democratic Contenders"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] Following the first tests in Iowa and New Hampshire it is clearer who is who among the Republicans and among the Democrats. In the former case, the struggle for the nomination is between Vice President Bush and Senator Robert Dole (and it looks as if it will be nip and tuck right up to the Republican convention, which opens on 15 August), with the Democrats, however, the position is clearer, at least for the moment. Congressman Richard Gephardt and Senator Paul Simon are well behind the leader who, to many people's surprise, is Governor of Massachusetts Michael Dukakis. At the recent primary in New Hampshire he received 36 percent of the Democratic vote, while Gephardt and Simon received 20 and 17 percent respectively. [passage omitted]

"Dukakis does not make a stunning impression. It is probably his intellect and sincerity that gain him respect. His intellect is highly concentrated. He is restrained, but entirely without pretentiousness.... He is a patent skinflint, a man who manages the state with a sense of revulsion for inefficiency and futile waste of resources." The U.S. paper THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR sees in these features of Dukakis' character the reasons for his success as governor of the State of Massachusetts which is economically prosperous in these hard times.

Unemployment there is only 2.5-3 percent compared with a national average of 6 percent. Massachusetts has an effective job creation and retraining program. In recent months they have been devising a general medical security plan. All this looks particularly effective against the background of the Washington administration's constant cuts in social expenditure.

Dukakis and his apparatus are making very skillful use of the "Massachusetts miracle" in their election propaganda, hinting that if Dukakis is elected it will spread throughout the country. And this approach is finding sympathy among Americans who, over the years the present administration has been in power, have gotten tired of leaders who take pride in their own reluctance to look into specific problems of the people's life. Of these voters one U.S. politician said: "They like serious people. They don't want any more 'good old boys'." Dukakis' rivals, questioning his ability to spread the "Massachusetts miracle" throughout the country, attribute the governor's successes to two factors: the outstanding organization of his election campaign and the biggest election fund of all the Democratic contenders. In fact, Dukakis election centers have been opened in nearly all states and the fund now totals around 13.5 million dollars. Dukakis has been helped in this by his wife, Kitty, a Jew. She has provided her husband with a certain amount of political and financial support from Jewish circles. Incidentally, the collection of funds for the governor was organized by Bob Farmer, a major specialist in these matters, who is responsible for the aphorism: "In my opinion, money is the very first primary, and that begins before Iowa. How much money you have collected shows whether you are a serious man or not."

The words are applicable to all the contenders. More interesting to us are the political views of the man who has a very considerable chance of "taking" the White House.

Dukakis once said that his development as a politician had been influenced by two people—John Kennedy, who is his ideal, and Joe McCarthy, who is associated with the dark days of political reprisals against progressive forces in America. "For me, McCarthy represents an antidemocratic, anticonstitutional, and very dangerous policy. He destroyed lives and reputations by accusing people of disloyalty, and this made me very angry," the governor said. [passage omitted]

Today he is opposed to U.S. support for right-wing regimes in various countries ("flirting with Batista, Somoza or Pinochet is a bad idea"), he advocates the observance of the Guatemala Accords in Central America, he is against aid for the contras, and he rejects Washington's "right" to carry out armed interference for the purpose of overthrowing governments it does not like. As for Near East problems, Dukakis does not exactly display originality. He believes that the way to a settlement lies through separate deals between individual Arab countries and Israel.

Michael Dukakis welcomed the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. But he said that it is "only the first step." In this connection, the journal MOTHER JONES asked him the following question:

"If you are elected president, what future steps will you take in the arms limitation sphere?"

"There are real opportunities for a considerable reduction in the strategic arms sphere, the placing of a complete ban on nuclear tests and missile tests, and also mutually coordinated conventional arms reductions. I believe that a vigorous effort is needed to achieve progress in these areas."

The "patent skinflint" Dukakis places military expenditure in the category of "futile waste." He has quite clearly stated the need to reduce appropriations for "star wars" and for the development of the MX missile system.

...There is a phenomenon in the U.S. political world which you might call the "amnesia syndrome," that is, loss of memory. The point is that very often, on attaining the cherished position, contenders somehow immediately forget their election promises and often change course in unexpected directions. It cannot be guaranteed in advance that the same will not happen in the case of the governor of Massachusetts. Especially as he could scarcely have collected his election millions without corresponding guarantees. And the "Massachusetts miracle"—the foundation of his election propaganda—has another side to it: The state's prosperity is largely due to military orders.

But today Michael Dukakis is waging a struggle using the slogans of economic stability, nuclear arms reductions, noninterference in other countries' affairs, and respect for human dignity. As his successes have demonstrated, there is much support for these slogans.

China

'Chill' in Sino-U.S. Relations Noted

OW200333 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Recently, the Western mass media have noticed a chill in Sino-U.S. relations. The Chinese press has also admitted destabilizing factors in Sino-U.S. relations. Why are there destabilizing factors? Many observers believe that they have been caused by Washington's interference in China's internal affairs, especially in the past year. It gives people the impression that the United States is bent on teaching China a lesson on how to handle its own affairs. Obviously, this involves not only the mass media but also influential political figures in the United States.

Following are a few examples: When student unrest occurred in the Chinese cities from late 1986 to early 1987, the United States openly meddled in China's internal affairs by encouraging the students to continue demonstrations. In August 1987 the United States, with a view to teaching China a lesson about family planning [words indistinct] stopped its U.S. $25 million (?annual contribution) to the United Nations Population Fund. Toward the end of 1987, some U.S. Congressmen who believed they were speaking on behalf of the Tibetan people went so far as to advocate Tibet's independence from the PRC and attempted to use the Dalai Lama to realize the scheme.

Lately there have been more incidents of U.S. interference in China's internal affairs, which have compelled China to take countermeasures. Huan Xiang, director of the PRC State Council's International Studies Center, warned in a recent issue of BEIJING REVIEW that if the United States continued to blackmail China and meddle in its domestic affairs, bilateral relations would deteriorate. Huan Xiang emphasized that the Chinese side [words indistinct] will make strong reactions to unpleasant incidents, and that China is not engaged in polemics with the United States and is keeping calm. Observers note that Washington has not demonstrated such calmness and restraint.

It seems that China's independent foreign policy has irritated some politicians in Washington. For example, China has criticized the United States for giving military aid to Nicaraguan rebels and for the Star Wars plan. The politicians in Washington do not understand that China is entitled to hold different views than those of the United States on international issues. The outdated views of U.S. politicians have deprived them of the capability to objectively observe international affairs. However, the reality of the world calls for new political ideas of mutual respect and understanding, so that bilateral relations may be established and develop on a fair and equal footing.

PRC Vice Minister on Space Research Program

PM191659 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Feb 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "China and Space Technology"]

[Text] After the successful launching of a series of satellites, China is focusing its efforts on researching scientific and technical questions connected with the creation of space stations and transporters and the development of other space technology. This was stated in an interview in CHINA DAILY by Sun Jiadong, PRC vice minister of astronautics. However, he noted that despite the existing achievements and accelerated work on these projects, China's space program remains "in the preparatory stage of development."

The vice minister announced that China has not yet devised a detailed plan for the use of single-mission and reusable space craft for transport operations in space. The implementation of the program currently being examined will hinge on the development of China's industrial technology and the availability of the necessary resources.

There have been 21 satellite launches in China since 1970, including 8 scientific and technical experimental satellites and 3 communications satellites. The data received via these satellites is used in geological research, the water resources industry, agriculture, oil exploration, the study of environmental protection problems, the laying of railroad track, weather forecasting, and the prediction of earthquakes and other natural disasters. Satellites are also used for television and radio transmissions and for military purposes, Sun Jiadong stated.

China is one of the world's leaders in terms of the level of development of space technology, the vice minister noted, and Chinese scientists have independently developed not only a system for the launch and retrieval of satellites but also a system for determining their coordinates, as well as the technology for launching several satellites into space using a single delivery vehicle. Chinese scientific and technical workers and engineers in the sphere of space technology have developed and created three types of delivery vehicles capable of putting heavy satellites into near-earth and geostationary orbit.

Two satellite launching centers have been set up in China—one at Jiuquan (Gansu Province) the other at Xichang (Sichuan Province). Right across the country there are satellite tracking stations linked to a central point at Weinan (Shenxi Province). At a ceremonial meeting to mark the 20th anniversary of the creation of the PRC Academy of Space Technology, it was stated that during its lifetime the scientific research and academic institution had trained 2,700 engineers specializing in the space industry sphere.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Industry Interested in Arms Development

OW191143 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 18 Feb 88

[Commentary by military observer Kalinin]

[Text] According to a recent MAINICHI SHIMBUN report, Japanese industrial circles have greater interests in the production of weapons. This tendency is revealed, for example, in the fact that the number of full members of the military manufacturers association founded in 1951 has increased from originally 99 enterprises to the current 113 enterprises during the past 2 years. It has also been pointed out that the increase of membership is due to the admission of manufacturers from electronic industry. It should also be stated here that the Defense Agency reorganized its technical research and development institute last year. According to the official information, the major objective for this reorganization is to step up the development of the most advanced military technology, above all, electronic engineering technology.

These facts indicate that Japan's economy, as well as its science and technology, have been further kept on the military track. I would like to point out in particular that Japan's munitions industry, as disclosed in SHUNKAN BUNSHUN [a weekly magazine published in Japan], has grown at a pace two times as fast as those in West European countries. According to the view of military experts, Japan's munitions industry can, in fact, not only fully meet the needs of the Japanese forces in peacetime but also has the potential to rapidly increase production of all types of modern weapons, including nuclear weapons.

In a report published in the beginning of the 1980's by the Council on the International Relations of the United States, no weapons exist that cannot be manufactured by the present munitions industry of Japan. Nevertheless, there arises a question: What outcome whatsoever will such a policy bring about in Japan?

It is observed in some quarters that from the economic viewpoint, this policy will bring profits. As is known to all, there is a close correlation between the expansion of munitions industry and the increase in military spending. The case in the United States clearly shows what results such a policy will bring about on economy. THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses that the enormous amont of funds the United States has spent on manufacturing weapons is one of the reasons why it has lost its economic superiority to Japan and other countries.

A recent Department of Defense report indicates that Japan already ranks fifth in the world in the amount of its military expenditures and second among the countries possessing no nuclear weapons. As far as the growth rate of military spending in the past decade is concerned, Japan has far superseded NATO member countries. There is doubt about the fact that the expansion of munitions industry will further stimulate the process of increasing military expenditures. As a result, the investment needed for the production of consumer goods will be promptly switched to the investment in nonproductive military department.

In addition, capable scholars and technicians will be needed in developing weapons. As far as private enterprises are concerned, this means an intensified brain drain. Moreover, the expansion of the munitions industry will have adverse effects on the employment problem. According to the calculation of American experts, with a fund of $1 billion, over 187,000 jobs can be created in the education field while with the same fund, only about 76,000 jobs can be created in the field of the munitions industry.

In this connection, apparently, it is a light conjecture that the munitions industry is profitable when considered from the economic viewpoint. It is a fabrication not only intentional but also dangerous in that the expansion of the munitions industry will strengthen Japan's national defense capability. Reliance on armed force failed to bring about expected results last time, and it

may bring about destruction this time. The destructive force of weapons and the stockpiling of an enormous amount of weapons have put mankind on the brink of self-destruction.

We have witnessed that the people of certain circles in Japan are interested in further expanding armament. However, armament will only further deteriorate the situation, and the development of such a situation is distantly related to security. In this connection, we cannot but agree with the view first stated in the journal SEKAI [World] at the beginning of the 1980's. SEKAI stated that the alternatives are either to take the road toward death for the sake of the military-industry complex or to work out a strategy for security and survival in the true sense of the word.

Japanese-U.S. Military Cooperation Criticized

PM241059 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Feb 88 Second Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Military-Political Commentary": "'Defense' as Understood by the Japan Defense Agency and the Pentagon"]

[Text] "The economic balance between the United States and Japan is too complex a question. Let us not rack our brains over it. After all, our countries are very friendly in the defense sphere, and we will certainly find a common language there." This, according to CBS Television, is what Admiral R. Hays, commander of U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, told Ts. Kawara, chief of the Japan Defense Agency, in Honolulu when the latter made a stop there on the way to Washington. That was a month ago. But even in such a short period of time, the television company's commentator stressed, there has been a "considerable advance in the sphere of military integration" between the United States and Japan.

This is true. In accordance with accords reached by Ts. Kawara, Washington and Tokyo are beginning concrete talks in two important areas. The first is the joint development of complex nonnuclear armaments. According to the Pentagon, these armaments will "compensate for the loss" as a result of the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles envisaged by the Soviet-American treaty. The U.S. military department is pinning big hopes on the utilization of Japan's mighty technological potential for militarist purposes. The second area is the advance stockpiling of U.S. heavy arms on Japanese soil. It is proposed that in an "emergency," the armed forces of both the United States and Japan itself would have access to these U.S. arsenals.

Since Ts. Kawara's return from the United States there has been a Japanese-American seminar in the Japanese city of Oiso on questions of joint naval strategy in the nineties. Admiral L. Welz [name as published], representative of the U.S. naval command, showed the participants a map of the areas of future actions by the two countries' navies. It is evident from it that the Japanese Navy has been given the responsibility of "defending" sea lanes in an area stretching from Kamchatka to the Philippines. The vast region south of it, including the southwestern part of the Pacific and the whole of the Indian Ocean, will be a zone of joint operations by the Japanese and U.S. navies.

According to a report in the paper SANKEI SHIMBUN, the Japanese participants in the seminar, although they expressed a "cautious attitude" toward the plan, did not reject it. Moreover, they assured the Americans that the naval command will make every effort to equip the Japanese Navy with its own aircraft carriers and ships with their own antiship missiles. In turn, the Americans have announced that in the course of the current year the Pentagon will transfer the cruiser ""Bunker Hill," the destroyer "Fife," and the frigate "Robert Bradley," armed with Tomahawk cruise missiles, for basing in Yokosuka.

At the moment Japanese and U.S. strategists are dealing in practice with the question of rehearsing aggressive joint actions by the two countries' armed forces. In the open sea off the island of Kyushu, Japanese and U.S. naval warships are involved in excercises in the course of which they are carrying out assault landing operations and "hunting" enemy submarines. In the island's airspace they are rehearsing operations which involve massive air strikes against ground targets. Exercises are being held involving, on the Japanese side, F-4 and F-15 fighters and E-2C Hawkeye early-warning aircraft and, on the U.S. side, F-18A fighters and AWACS aircraft. Japanese-American exercises are also taking place on the northernmost island—Hokkaido. Subunits from the Japanese 5th Ground Forces Division and U.S. servicemen brought in the from the Hawaiian Islands are waging combat actions against "enemy skiers."

Commenting on these facts, which are evidence of the activation of U.S. and Japanese militarist preparations and the further deepening of their military integration, the democratic press in Japan itself and in Asian countries stresses in particular that the course Washington and Tokyo are following has nothing to do with "joint defense." It blatantly contradicts the trends toward the relaxation of tension which are becoming increasingly apparent in the life of the Asian-Pacific region.

Japan's Storage of U.S. Hardware Not Ruled Out

LD201146 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 20 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 20 TASS—The Government of Japan does not deny the possibility of creating strategic reserves of U.S. combat hardware and military equipment in the country in the event of an "emergency". This was stated in the Budgetary Commission of the lower house of parliament on Friday by Sosuke Uno, Japanese minister of foreign affairs. He emphasized that the

country's being drawn into the U.S. strategy of the so-called prepositioned storage did not run counter to the provisions of the "security treaty" between Tokyo and Washington.

The KYODO TSUSHIN news agency reported earlier that U.S. Secretary of Defence Frank Carlucci is to arrive in Japan in May for a visit. Time for the start of a "joint study" of the question of the transfer of additional U.S. units to Japan in an "emergency" will be determined during his talks with Japanese military leaders.

The prepositioned [as received] storage of a large amount of tanks, armoured personnel carriers, ammunition and other equipment for the needs of the contingent will be also considered during the consultations.

Japan Develops Computer Military Command Center
LD220842 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 1 TASS—A new computer command center has begun operating in an underground bunker at the Yokosuka naval base south of Tokyo, charged with exercised all-round control over Japanese naval activities in the north-western Pacific, including the blocking of international straits there in the event of "contingencies".

The center's capabilities and even the date when it went into operation are a secret.

But KYODO TSUSHIN news agency has been able to find out that it is backed up by microwave communications stations and complete with supercomputers processing large amounts of data at a fast speed.

They make it possible to control all the Japanese Navy's combat and auxiliary ships at the same time, maintaining cooperation at the same time with the commands of the ground and air forces.

KYODO TSUSHIN described the new battle management center as another long stride to preparing Japan for military activities in the international straits of the region and the 1,000-mile zone of sea lanes.

The strategy relies on a large force of missile warships which the Japanese military commanders already consider reinforcing with an own "light aircraft-carrier", despite the fact that Tokyo once "solemnly renounced" the possession of such offensive arms.

Preparations for naval activities in the 1,000-mile zone account for a large part of the country's military spending which has been growing much faster than similar expenditures in the NATO nations.

Japan will place fifth overall and second among the non-nuclear states of the world for its military spending this fiscal year.

South Korean Students Seize U.S. Culture Center
LD241009 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 24 TASS—A group of students today seized the building of the U.S. Cultural Center in Seoul in protest against tomorrow's scheduled inauguration of retired General No Tae-u as South Korean president.

DPRK Denounces 'Team Spirit-88' Exercises
LD232357 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Pyongyang February 23 TASS—The U.S.-South Korean side should immediately stop actions leading to the sharpening of the situation in the Korean peninsula, Major-General Yi Tae-Ho, chief delegate of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), told a session of the Military Commission on Truce in Korea held in Panmunjom today. He criticized Washington and Seoul's decision to conduct large-scale joint military manoeuvres, "Team Spirit-88", this year.

The regular rehearsal of a nuclear conflict in the Korean peninsula and other provocative actions by the U.S. and South Korean military in the demilitarized zone bear witness that the United States and the South Korean authorities are out to hinder in every way the relaxation of tension, resumption of the dialogue and achievement of national reconciliation in Korea, he noted.

Yi Tae-Ho dismissed as groundless the claims by Rear-Admiral William Pendley, a U.S. representative, about the DPRK's aggressiveness and drew attention to the Republic's initiatives aimed at reducing troops and armaments in Korea and halting large-scale military manoeuvres in that region. He called upon the United States and South Korea to respond positively to these proposals by the DPRK.

Oriental Studies Director Views Korean Issue
OW230327 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] A few days ago, Soviet and Foreign international scholars and journalists held a roundtable conference to discuss various questions concerning the building of a peace and security system in the Asia-Pacific region, including ways to settle the Korean issue and eliminate other hot spots in the region. Kapitsa, a noted Soviet political scientist, social activist, director of the Oriental Studies Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences, and chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries, attended the conference. Professor Kapitsa, correspondence academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is now at this station on invitation to discuss the views he expounded at the roundtable conference on the way to settle the Korean issue. Professor Kapitsa says:

[Begin Kapitsa recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation] My dear listeners: Mass media in Asia and other parts of the world have been actively discussing the Soviet program for the strengthening of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. One of the program's key points is to mitigate regional military conflicts, eliminate hot spots, and seek a peaceful settlement of disputes in the region.

The situation in the Korean peninsula is a sharp issue. As far as the Korean people are concerned, the question of reunifying their fatherland is inseparable from the struggle for relaxing the tension, eliminating the military and political confrontation between North and South, and creating the necessary conditions for such reunification. The DPRK considers the establishment of a confederal republic a feasible formula for the reunification of North and South Korea. DPRK leaders stand for the peaceful and (?democratic) reunification of Korea without foreign interference; that is, on the premise that U.S. troops be withdrawn from South Korea.

In December 1986, a leader of Democratic Korea proposed that high-level military and political talks between North and South be held as the first practical step to resuming dialogue between the two sides on a wide range of questions. Later, Pyongyang further developed this proposal by proposing that the DPRK and South Korean prime ministers, if possible, hold a meeting to discuss the most important question concerning the health of the political situation in the Korean peninsula. However, Seoul has insisted on conducting talks on economic, humanistic [ren wen], and parliamentary questions before holding such a meeting. What is more, Washington and Seoul have, from time to time, made moves causing greater instability in the Korean peninsula. For example, Lance missiles, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, were deployed in the Korean peninsula not long ago, and the United States and South Korea conducted a large-scale, provocative military exercise code-named "Team Spirit-87." These are cases in point. Such open, adventurist acts were described as proof that the United States is fully prepared to give South Korea quick and effective support in case of an armed invasion of the latter.

One may ask: Where will the invasion come from? Of course, it will come from the North. To prove this, the United States and its partners have begun to talk endlessly about what they call strong Soviet military strength and Democratic Korean conspiracies. It is against this background that the DPRK position appears to be very practical and reasonable. This is because it is of prime importance to create an atmosphere of security and mutual trust and then solve specific problems concerning cooperation between North and South. A proposal put forward by the DPRK Government last July is of great significance. The proposal calls for a stage-by-stage reduction of 100,000 troops by North and South each from 1988 to 1991, and the simultaneous withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea. When North and South each reduce to the requisite number, all U.S. military bases in South Korea should be dismantled. The proposal also calls for turning the demilitarized zone into a peace zone. To discuss all such questions, the DPRK proposed that North and South Korea and the United States hold talks in Geneva in March 1988, and that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Sweden, members of the Neutral Countries Commission for the Supervision of the Korean Armistice, participate in the talks as observers. This proposal urges North and South to exchange statements in which the way to hold the talks and their contents should be discussed.

The Soviet Union supports the DPRK principle of reunifying Korea on a democratic basis, and without foreign interference. The Soviet Union believes that relaxing the tense situation in the Korean peninsula and consolidating the peace of Korea will promote the establishment of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and other parts of the world. [end recording]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Filipinos 'Struggle' Against U.S. Military Bases

U.S. 'Control' of Economy

OW221105 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] Salvador Laurel, vice president of the Philippines, once emphatically remarked that the Philippine-U.S. agreement on military bases is a colonialist document. One can hardly take exception to his statement. Under the document's unequal provisions, the Philippines is relegated to a position of total dependence on the Pentagon and the U.S. capitalists. In their efforts to do away with these provisions, the Philippine people have waged a struggle for 40 years now.

The military bases agreement was signed on 14 March 1947. It provides that the United States will have the right to use 23 areas in the Philippines for free for 99 years for the purpose of building military facilities, military strongholds, radar stations, munition depots, gasoline storages, and so on. The total acreage of the U.S. military bases is about 10,000 square km.

However, as far back as March 1953, the Filipinos raised the point that it runs counter to the legal status of the Philippines as an independent nation to place these military bases and coastal defense works under U.S. control. Conflicts have erupted in connection with the right to tap the military bases' underground resources and the restrictions of movement imposed on the Filipinos in the base areas. In addition, because the Americans are vested with extraterritoriality, the U.S. soldiers have been disdainful of the local residents working in the base areas. This has frequently resulted in murders and rapes where the culprits can go scot-free.

Moreover, the military bases treaty has given the United States unlimited opportunities to control the Philippine national economy. Long before the Philippines became an independent nation, the United States already had

some economic leverage to apply pressure on the Philippine Government. Now the same leverage is again applied as the fate of the U.S. military bases is being decided. As the PHILIPPINE DAILY EXPRESS noted, whether the economic relations between the United States and the Philippines can be expanded depends directly upon whether the U.S. military bases will remain or not.

Pressure on the Corazon Aquino administration was used by the White House on the eve of the bases talks. But immediately before the U.S.-Philippine talks started, opponents to the U.S. military presence became clearly more active. Statements calling for the dismantling of the U.S. military bases resounded in the government, as well as among all social strata in the Philippines. In the opinion of (Don Jata), a Philippine statesman who commands universal respect in the country, there is no need for talks; all the government needs to do is to declare the bases treaty abrogated.

Opposition to the deployment of nuclear arms on the bases and the port entry by nuclear-armed U.S. warships was also a major form of the struggle against the military bases. Many large trade unions are aiming at this goal in waging their struggle. A resolution adopted by the consultation committee of these trade unions points out that once the bases are removed, the independence of the Philippines will be assured and the country will be out of danger of becoming extinct.

However, the position taken by Washington on this issue has been one of tit for tat. Otherwise, what reason can it offer to explain why the nuclear-powered supercarrier "Enterprise" has sailed into Subic Bay where the naval base is located? According to (Marapada), general secretary of the League for a Nuclear-Free Philippines, there are tactical nuclear weapons aboard this warship. In view of this, the MANILA (?INQUIRER) carried a cartoon depicting the U.S. carrier "Enterprise" tearing a hole in the Philippine constitution, which carries the words, defend the nonnuclear status of the country.

It is very obvious to the Filipino people that they must persist in their unswerving struggle to stop the U.S. military presence in their country. The facts show that if no struggle is waged against it, the Pentagon has no intention to withdraw from its position. The Filipino people have come to realize that they must not let any good opportunity slip by in their struggle for security and independence.

Talks Begin in March

LD241054 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Manila February 24 TASS—Raul Manglapus, minister of foreign affairs of the Philippines, said that the Philippine-American talks on the status of the U.S. military bases in the archipelago will begin in the last week of March.

It is pointed out in the circles close to the Foreign Affairs Ministry of the Philippines that the upcoming talks will serve as a basis for the resolution by Manila of the question whether the U.S. military presence in that country shall be prolonged after the term of the bilateral agreement on bases expires in 1991.

Letisia Shahani, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Philippine Senate, stressed that all the members of the committee advocate a strict observance of the provision of the country's constitution according to which it shall pursue a policy of freedom from nuclear weapons. The question is, she said, how control can be exercised over the introduction and stockpiling of nuclear munitions while the United States persists in not recognizing, although not denying, the presence of nuclear weapons in their military bases.

The three bills being now examined by the upper chamber of the Congress of the Philippines call for a total ban on production, introduction, and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the territory of the Philippines. They also provide for tough sanctions against any foreign power violating the non-nuclear principles of the Philippines.

Gorbachev Message Conveyed to Suharto

BK221214 Jakarta Domestic Service in Indonesian 1200 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] President Suharto has received a verbal message from Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev regarding the planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan beginning 15 May. Soviet Ambassador to Indonesia Vladimir Semenov disclosed this to newsmen after calling on President Suharto at Merdeka Palace today to convey Gorbachev's personal message on the latest developments in Afghanistan.

According to Semenov, the 100,000 Soviet soldiers will be withdrawn in stages and the process is expected to be completed in 10 months. However, the withdrawal will be speeded up if all the parties involved in the conflict show goodwill and do not interfere in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

Asked about the parties involved in the settlement, the Soviet ambassador to Indonesia referred to Pakistan and Iran as Afghanistan's immediate neighbors.

Gromyko Sends Message to South Pacific Forum

LD231452 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 23 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ratified Protocols 2 and 3 to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific (Rarotonga Treaty), thereby declaring the intention of the USSR to fulfill its obligations under these protocols, Andrey Gromyko said in a message to the heads of state of the South Pacific Forum nations in connection with the ratification.

The Soviet Union, the president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued, expresses the hope that the Rarotonga Treaty will be joined by all the states grouped in the South Pacific Forum and urges the nuclear powers that have not done this to act as guarantors of the Rarotonga Treaty after signing and ratifying the corresponding protocols to it.

SRV, PRC Statements on Territorial Violation

LD222233 Moscow TASS in English 2219 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Hanoi February 22 TASS—A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) here has come forward with a statement that on January 31, this year, four Chinese naval ships entered Vietnam's territorial waters in the area of Truong Sa (Spratly) islands and performed provocative actions with regard to two Vietnamese transport ships. The Chinese ships are still in the Vietnamese waters up to now.

"Such unfriendly steps are an encroachment upon the SRV's sovereignty, the statement says. They threaten the security of Vietnam, and increase tension and instability in Southeast Asia."

"The SRV's foreign ministry again reaffirms Vietnam's sovereignty over Truong Sa and Hoang Sa (Paracel) archipelagos and urges China immediately to withdraw its ships from the territorial waters of Vietnam and cease any actions violating the sovereignty of the SRV".

The XINHUA news agency reports that a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (PRC) made a statement in Beijing today. The statement says, in particular, that "Truong Sa and Hoang Sa islands have been the age-old sovereign territory of China. The Chinese side sent the ships and boats to the area of Truong Sa islands for inspection and normal patrolling. This is our sovereign affair. The Vietnamese authorities have no right to interfere in it".

SRV Minister Speaks on Cambodia Withdrawal

LD231731 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 23 TASS—Vietnam will fully withdraw its troops from the territory of the People's Republic of Kampuchea not later than the end of 1990, Vietnam's Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach said today.

In an interview with the Japanese news agency KYODO in Hanoi, the Vietnamese minister pointed out that the Kampuchean problem could only be resolved by way of talks.

The trend towards dialogue was irreversible, he emphasized.

The minister expressed the hope that negotiations between Chairman of Kampuchea's Council of Ministers Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk would be resumed.

Lao, Thai Military Delegations End Talks

LD241105 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Vientiane February 24 TASS—The military delegations of Laos and Thailand ended talks here today for settling the border conflict between the two countries.

In a joint statement after the negotiations they expressed satisfaction with the successful fulfillment of the decisions to cease fire and draw troops back from the line of engagement and with the work done by the joint military commission.

The participants in the meeting, which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, decided that the joint commission will continue working until successful talks are held between two government delegations for resolving problems in the border area by peaceful means.

The talks are to begin in the immediate future.

The leader of the Thai delegation, General Chavalit Yongchayut, and accompanying officials paid a visit to acting Lao President Phoumi Vongvichit. During the meeting stress was made on the benefit for both sides of further developing bilateral relations.

Guided by feelings of friendship, Laos returned two Thai pilots to Thailand. The leader of the Thai military delegation expressed profound gratitude in this connection.

The sides agreed to continue reciprocal visits.

Near East & South Asia

Pakistan's Noorani Charges Soviets Violate Pact

Noorani 'Distorting' Truth

LD231856 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 23 Feb 88

["Political Commentary" by Viktor Ilyichev]

[Text] The state minister for foreign affairs of Pakistan, Zain Noorani, has charged the Soviet Union with violating the agreement in the process of settling the Afghan conflict. The minister insists that there was an agreement on first forming a provisional government in Kabul and then withdrawing Soviet troops. But was there such an agreement? The simplest answer would be that the Pakistani minister is distorting the truth and misleading the world community. That is made clear by the Soviet statement on Afghanistan of 8 February, in which Mikhail Gorbachev put down the exact dates of withdrawing

Soviet troops, in accordance with repeatedly expressed wishes by Pakistan and the United States, the two countries backing the armed opposition waging a war in Afghanistan.

As far as the future Kabul government is concerned, setting it up is the internal Afghan affair. Neither Moscow nor Washington nor Islamabad can impose their stooges on the Afghan people and thus interfere with the country's national affairs. This is the clear and unequivocal position of the Soviet Union.

On Monday, talking to the United States' Secretary George Shultz, Mikhail Gorbachev denied again that the Soviet Union had any secret plans for Afghanistan. The Soviet leader suggested that the American side should adhere to the agreements already reached and help end the conflict in order to make Afghanistan an independent, nonaligned, and neutral state. To achieve that, Afghan people must solve their own problems without external interference.

But back to the rash accusations leveled at the Soviet Union by the Pakistani foreign minister. We could quote an influential United States' congressman who said the other day that it was Pakistan that had shifted position, or we might refer to that saying known to many nations about whitewashing the black and tarring the white; that is, shifting the blame onto the wrong party. Is there a corresponding saying in the language spoken by Zain Noorani, I wonder?

Pakistan Seeks To 'Delay' Accords

LD232029 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] New Delhi February 23 TASS—The latest statements by Pakistani officials show that some quarters in Islamabad are engaged not so much in a search for ways of a real settlement of the Afghanistan situation, as in quests for pretexts, on the basis of which it would be possible to delay the signing of Geneva accords.

According to reports coming here, speaking at the airport of the Pakistani capital on his return from Beijing, Zain Noorani, Pakistani minister of state for foreign affairs, said that the Soviet statement on Afghanistan did not contain anything new and was allegedly incapable of ensuring a peaceful settlement of the Afghan crisis. Noorani repeated further Islamabad's well-known stand artifically linking a return of Afghan refugees from Pakistan home with forming a coalition government in Afghanistan. The Pakistani minister of state put forth also a demand for replacing the present government and removing Najibullah as a condition for forming such a government.

The question of forming a coalition government is undoubtedly important. However, it is up to Afghans and not Pakistan to settle it. Islamabad cannot claim for forming such a government on its own in a neighbouring country.

A spokesman of the Afghan Republic's Embassy in Pakistan said that the Pakistani regime was deliberately dragging its feet with signing Geneva accords, creating thereby roadblocks in the way of a settlement. He said that the present President of Afghanistan, Najibullah, had been elected by authoritative representatives of the people at the Loya Jirgah. Therefore, his resignation is out of question. As for the composition of a future coalition government, the Afghan diplomat noted that the right of any party was to work for participation in it, but the right to elect belongs only to the Afghan people. He noted in conclusion that the Afghan Army was capable of settling on its own all tasks facing it.

Afghanistan's Rafi' on Reconciliation Process

PM232131 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Brigadier General Muhammad Rafi', Afghan National Defense Minister, by own correspondent D. Meshchaninov in Kabul; date not given: "Let the Guns Fall Silent"]

[Text] Question: What is your opinion of the statements on Afghanistan by M.S. Gorbachev and President Najibullah?

Answer: The statements are evidence of a sincere interest in the speediest settlement of the Afghan problem. Fixing a time for the start of the Soviet troops' withdrawal has eliminated the last stumbling block in the way of signing an agreement in Geneva. This was precisely the question that Islamabad and its overseas partners were holding up as the main pretext for interfering in the country's internal affairs.

Now the way is open to a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. This does not mean, of course, that forces hostile to my country are not trying to undermine the Geneva talks. But I am hopeful that reason will prevail and that the guns will fall silent for good. It is clear to all sensible people that the unique chance must not be missed.

Question: In which regions of the country does the situation remain the most tense?

Answer: As ever, in the provinces bordering Pakistan. Here are the latest examples. Attempts have been made to destroy border posts in Khowst District and around Asadabad. Missile attacks have been made on a number

of district centers in Qandahar and Nangarhar Provinces, and peaceful inhabitants, including women and children, have been killed as a result. And yet, despite the despairing attempts to heat up the situation, the counterrevolution is becoming played out.

Armed formations, large and small, belonging to a variety of groupings, continue to come over to the side of the people's power. In the period of a little over a year since the national reconciliation policy was announced, more than 40,000 rebels have laid down their arms. And this process is gathering force.

Question: For many years the Western mass media tried to persuade the public that, without the Soviet troops' help, the Afghan Army "would not last a day." Now reports are appearing which claim that if the foreign assistance ceases, the rebels will be "rapidly destroyed by the powerful Afghan Army." What do you think of that?

Answer: If Western and other patrons had not given vast financial and military aid to the counterrevolution, there would have been no war in Afghanistan. It was precisely because of outside interference that the bloody armed conflict erupted. Then our Soviet brothers came to our aid at the Afghan people's request. The internationalist soldiers helped the Afghan people to defend their freedom and independence. That's the truth.

If the subsidizing of antigovernment forces ceases, then—and here I agree with the Western press—it will be no trouble for the Afghan Army to defeat the rebels. But we do not favor the solution of the problem by force. We favor the resolution of all disputes at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. The national reconciliation policy has become a reality and is bearing fruit. People who only recently were fighting against one another are seeking and finding a common language for the sake of achieving the long-awaited peace.

Four provinces are now led by former active oppositionists. More than 65 percent of the posts in local organs of power are now held not by PDPA members but by prominent representatives of the opposition, the clergy, and various strata of society who have accepted the national reconciliation policy. The coalition form of rule at different levels is not just a declaration but a reality, which only a blind man can fail to see.

Question: And yet, a number of leaders of the so-called "Alliance of Seven" remain unreconciled in their position and refuse to hold talks about taking part in a coalition government of Afghanistan....

Answer: Yes, that is so. The "Alliance" has no excuse left for continuing the undeclared war against its own people. For many years its members accused the government of supposedly endangering Islam and claimed that the Soviet troops would never leave the country. But, as we know, even in the past the people's power has never acted against religion, and the new constitution ratified by the Loya Jirgah officially proclaims Islam the "holy religion" of Afghanistan. And the statements by our countries' leaders have also removed the problem of the timetable for the Soviet troops' withdrawal once an appropriate understanding [dogovorennost] is reached in Geneva.

The constitution officially confirms the PDPA's renunciation of the monopoly of power and enshrines the principle of a multiparty state. The opposition has been offered important state posts. I believe that the most sensible thing for the leaders of the seven opposition groupings headquartered in the Pakistani city of Peshawar to do would be to join in the national reconciliation process and take part in a coalition government.

At a turning point for Afghanistan we must forget past injuries and differences, step across prior convictions and prejudices, and seek and find sensible compromises. Those who are calling for a continuation of the bloodshed expose themselves before world public opinion as enemies of the Afghan people, who have finally acquired real hope of an end to the protracted armed conflict.

Question: What do you see as the Afghan Armed Forces' role in the nationwide reconciliation process?

Answer: As long as the interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs continues and "unreconciled" bands go on committing crimes on Afghan soil, the Armed Forces will stand vigilantly on watch over our people's gains and continue to reinforce their training and combat readiness. At the same time, under the conditions of the difficult process of achieving national accord, the constructive and propaganda functions of Army units and subunits assumes particular importance.

What I have in mind is helping the peaceful population to restore homes and villages [aryki], mosques and schools destroyed by the war, as well as explanatory work. Army propaganda detachments are working in the most remote corners of the country, explaining to the inhabitants the noble aims of the national reconciliation policy, providing primary necessities and medical supplies, and distributing free aid from the Soviet Union.

I should like to take the opportunity to express sincere gratitude to the Soviet people for their selfless fraternal assistance. We will never forget that the internationalist soldiers were with us in the most difficult days in our history, and that they fought in the toughest sectors for the sake of a happy future for the Afghan people. Such things are not forgotten.

You witnessed the solemnity with which the imposing monument in honor of Afghan-Soviet combat community was unveiled near the Defense Ministry building. You heard what the people attending the ceremony said. Every word came right from the heart, and expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet internationalist soldiers for their fighting exploits on the soil of Afghanistan.

Gandhi Message Presented to Najibullah

LD231848 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] New Delhi February 23 TASS—India welcomes the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on Afghanistan and hopes that the Geneva negotiations will lead to a final settlement of the Afghan problem. This is underlined in the message of India's President Ramaswamy Venkataraman, which was read out at the parliament session which opened in New Delhi.

Despite positive changes in solving the Afghan problem, certain circles are piling up obstacles on the way to its settlement, the message says. India supports contacts with all sides concerned and along with them will exert efforts to see to it that Afghanistan should remain a sovereign, independent and non-aligned country, the president said.

Special representative of the prime minister, Secretary of the Ministry of Information and Radio Broadcasting of India Gopi Krishna Arora went to Kabul today with a message from Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to President of the Republic of Afghanistan Najibullah. He will meet Afghanistan's leaders to specify the situation that developed as a result of Pakistan's attempts to go away from an agreed upon settlement and political solution of the Afghan problem, the newspaper "TIMES OF INDIA" writes.

Syrian Leader's 24 Feb Visit Reportedly Denied

LD241121 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 1100 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 24 Feb (KUNA)—The Syrian Embassy in Moscow has denied that Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad will begin an official visit to the Soviet Union today.

In a telephone contact with KUNA here, the embassy confirmed that the reports on President al-Asad's visit to Moscow are false. It noted that "there is a Soviet invitation for President al-Asad to visit the Soviet Union. The date has not yet been fixed".

The embassy also indicated that the Syrian president is unlikely to visit Moscow at the moment because he is busy preparing for festivities marking the 8 March revolution.

U.S. Advantages, 'Islamic Factor' in Gulf War

PM240925 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by A. Vasilyev, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Africa Institute, under the rubric "Specialist's Opinion": "The Persian Gulf: Why Does the Fire Not Go Out?"]

[Text] The simplest option is to explain the Iran-Iraq war and the buildup of military operations in the Persian Gulf in terms of "imperialist intrigues." First, one can hardly exaggerate the role played by the CIA, other intelligence agencies, and Western propaganda in whipping up the conflict between Iran and Iraq or the contribution made by arms dealers and even certain governments from some 15 countries to maintaining the fire. The "Iran-Contras" deal is a graphic example but not the only one of its kind. Second, surely we are encouraged to offer this explanation by the almost daily demonstration of American military might in the Persian Gulf?

But to isolate the external, global causes from the "grassroots," internal, regional causes would be tantamount to oversimplifying and distorting the picture.

Imperialist interference and anti-imperialist struggle in the region are a reality. But Iranian-Arab rivalry, Arab and Persian nationalism, and the Islamic factor are no less of a reality.

Arab nationalism is progressive and democratic in its national liberation context, but it can develop into chauvinism with regard to national minorities and into a competing ideology vis-a-vis the nationalism of neighboring peoples. Exactly the same can be said of Persian (Iranian) nationalism.

The burning coals of rival nationalisms and religious-political disputes can easily be fanned into local conflagrations. The ideas of national and religious superiority and exclusivity stupefy the minds of the masses and encourage leaders to implement the kind of foreign policy in which the tasks of regional domination, pressure, and interference in others' internal affairs become the "norm," as does the practice of turning to military force or threatening to use this force. All this creates exceptionally favorable conditions for imperialist interference and manipulation of those who think they are acting quite independently.

The Iran-Iraq war began in September 1980. Baghdad gives one date when military operations began and Tehran gives another. Both sides blame the enemy for the fact that the war began.

It can be argued that in the first stage of the war Baghdad was counting on the weakening and decentralization of power in Iran in view of the fact that national minorities—Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Lori, and Baluchi—account for more than one-third of this country's population, and ethnic Arabs live in the province bordering on Iraq—Khuzestan. However, the war has in fact intensified Iranian centralization and Muslim and Shi'ite religious feelings are running higher than ever before.

It can also be argued that Tehran was likewise counting on the religious sympathies of Iraqi Shi'ites and on friction between Shi'ites and the essentially secular ideology of the ruling Ba'th party and also on the conflicts between Kurds and Arabs. Allow me to remind you that two-thirds of the Arab population of Iraq belong to the

Shi'ite wing of Islam (the main Shi'ite holy cities of Karbala' and al-Najjar are in Iraq), one-third are Sunnis, and Kurds account for one-quarter of this country's population. In actual fact Arab nationalism has proved to be stronger than Shi'ite religious sympathies and has become a cohesive factor.

Using slogans such as "The fatherland is in danger!", nationalist and religious propaganda, security measures, and hardline measures to crush the opposition, the Shi'ite regime in Iran and the Ba'th regime in Iraq have become stronger to a certain extent. It is clear that the loss of human life, suffering, and devastation are giving rise to resentment among the population in both countries and a desire among many to end the carnage at any price. But to the outside observer these feelings are hardly noticeable, and it is still hard to judge at present whether they have become decisive domestic political factors.

In the first stage of the war, the Iraqis seized a small part of Iranian territory. In the years that have followed, regardless of the number of casualties, the Iranians have apparently occupied several hundred square kilometers of Iraqi territory. The two countries' military potentials are determined by the size of their populations, the level of their socioeconomic development, the combat training and morale of their armies, and their level of armament. It is generally considered that the mobilizing potential of countries which have reached the level of development of Iran and Iraq is approximately 5 percent of the total population. This gives 650,000 fighters for Iraq (although this figure, according to data provided by the Western press, has been considerably exceeded) and the possibility of some 2 million people under arms for Iran. Considering Iraqi superiority in aircraft, tanks, artillery, and other types of weapons, the two rivals' military potentials can be considered approximately equal. Neither of the warring sides has yet been able to achieve a decisive breakthrough in military operations and gain victory.

The situation has reached stalemate, so to speak. But its victims are human beings rather than chess figures. The war, which has already taken some 1.2 million lives, has become the most bloody conflict since World War II, to say nothing of the material devastation and economic loss. In continuing the war, the peoples of Iran and Iraq are both losing out.

So who is winning? The answer would seem to be obvious—the United States—which brings us back to the beginning of the article. After all, surely the removal of these two countries—Iran and Iraq—from the anti-imperialist front is in Washington's imperial interests? Surely the war has provided the pretext for concentrating American naval forces in the Persian Gulf and in the approaches to it, and involving warships from NATO countries, which has been a long-term aim of Washington policy since the early seventies? After all, flexing military muscle in various parts of the "third world" and scoring points within the sceme of global confrontation with the Soviet Union is the essence of "neoglobalism." In the context of the Persian Gulf region, this means controlling the oil flow to Japan and Western Europe and bringing forces capable of using nuclear weapons closer to Soviet borders.

But, first, the United States' real state and, if you like, national interests are by no means synonymous with a hardline imperial policy. Second, even within the framework of this policy the dividends may turn and indeed are turning into losses. The Iran-Iraq conflict could spread in one form or another to the sparsely populated, weak, contradiction-torn, but fantastically rich oil monarchies of Arabia, where the United States' main economic interests lie. American naval operations in the waters of the Persian Gulf have not reduced but actually increased the threat to commercial shipping and oil transportation. The random nature of selective American strikes against Iranian targets and selective Iranian strikes against ships from various countries and oil installations on the Arabian shore of the Gulf demonstrates Washington's impotence, undermines its authority, and faces it with a choice—to withdraw from the Gulf or begin to escalate military operations. But what form should this escalation take? Should it sink the Iranian launches? This would be equivalent to using a baseball bat against a swarm of gnats. Should it bomb Iran? But this would mean coming into the war on the Iraqi side, prompting Iranian counteraction, which could possibly take the form of terrorism, and undermining a world power's chance to play a part in a political settlement. The experience of Vietnam or Libya is proof enough of the military effect to be achieved from bombing campaigns.

The Soviet leadership has always described the Iran-Iraq war as senseless, fratricidal, and counter to the interests of both the Iranian and the Iraqi peoples, and has always spoken out in favor of a peaceful, political settlement of the conflict. It is not simply a question of keepingt in accord with the principles of Soviet foreign policy. A military conflagration flaring up right on the doorstep of our southern borders is counter to Soviet interests. Restrictions on shipping in the Persian Gulf and reduced possibilities for economic cooperation with Iran and Iraq are also at variance with Soviet interests. The process of bringing U.S. naval forces closer to the Soviet Union's southern borders to a distance from which American aircraft with nuclear weapons on board could reach Soviet territory is also counter to the USSR's security interests.

If you think in terms of global confrontation, power struggles, the use of "rapid deployment forces," and zones of "vitally important interests," Washington's actions appear logical, if fraught with reverses and defeats. But if you are concerned with the question of creating a new atmosphere in international relations and a balance of interests rather than imperial ambitions, the

hierarchy of Washington's political goals could evidently be changed and the task of reaching a settlement moved into the forefront in place of the task of fanning local conflicts.

The USSR recognizes that the United States and other Western countries have real, legitimate interests in the Persian Gulf region. These interests are connected with economic, scientific, technical, and other forms of cooperation, trade, the problem of ensuring oil supplies, and the maintenance of traditional friendly relations between the United States and a number of countries in the region. The Soviet Union also has its own economic and other interests in the region. Naturally, the interests of powers which do not belong to this zone are only legitimate when they are aimed at cooperation rather than confrontation and at mutual understanding rather than diktat, and when they do not imply a constant military presence, the establishment of foreign military bases on others' territory, and the formation of military alliances.

The way to resolve the Iran-Iraq conflict is opened by UN Security Council Resolution 598, which was approved unanimously on 20 July last year. The cessation of military operations, the withdrawal of troops to national borders, and the beginning of negotiations to reach a settlement are all actions which, if carried out in any sequence or simultaneously, would open the way to peace. The withdrawal of all foreign warships from the Persian Gulf and the establishment of a naval force there under the UN flag would contribute to a settlement of the conflict.

Baghdad has more than once stated its willingness for a political settlement. And there are some signs of possible changes in Tehran's attitude, which previously rejected any peace settlement until it had overthrown the Ba'th regime in Iraq. Naturally, the right atmosphere for seeking a settlement is needed. This means that nationalist and religious passions at the local level must cool down, any desire for revenge must be abandoned, a spirit of cooperation must prevail on a global scale, and the great powers must conduct a policy dictated by the lofty interests of preserving peace.

Official Praises Kuwait's Efforts in Gulf War

LD241112 Kuwait KUNA in English 1021 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, Feb 24 (KUNA)—The Soviet Union Wednesday commended Kuwait's "distinguished" attitude toward regional and international issues steered by H.H. the Amir Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad.

The effective and active role Kuwait is playing in international relations is attributed to the Amir "whose wise political trend enjoys high reputation," head of the Arab Gulf Department at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Ivanov Galistin [name as received] said.

The Soviet Union deeply appreciates Kuwait's diplomatic efforts to end the Iraq-Iran war before it expands and drags other neutral countries to its flames, he said, adding Moscow agrees with Kuwait that negotiations is the only way to end the armed conflict.

In a statement to the Soviet agency "NOVOSTI" on the occasion of Kuwait's 27th national day celebrations, Galistin said the Soviet Union appreciates Kuwait's efforts to establish good neighbourly relations with the countries of the region, including Iran, and with the Soviet Union on the other hand.

Kuwait's voice is heard in support of the international peace conference on the Middle East crisis as it is strongly heard on the need to foster comprehensive world peace, disarmament, Central America conflicts settlements and the struggle for liberation by the people of Namibia, he said.

The Kuwaiti leadership understands reconciliation in Afghanistan and the steps taken to resolve the crisis through the organisation of the Islamic Conference, which Kuwait currently heads, the Soviet official said.

Gorbachev Messages to Arab Leaders Outlined

LD231035 Kuwait KUNA in English 0915 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Kuwait, Feb 23 (KUNA)—In recent letters to Arab heads of state, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev sought assistance for leap-frogging hurdles impeding a plan for total withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, a leading Kuwaiti newspaper reported Tuesday.

Gorbachev's messages, conveyed by envoys during Middle East tours this month, also dealt with the Iran-Iraq war and the Palestinian question, AL-QABAS daily said in a Paris-datelined report which was quoting "senior Arab diplomatic sources."

The Soviet leader told Arab heads of state he would not oppose a new Security Council resolution which would clamp an arms embargo on Iran if the Tehran government continued to ignore international peace calls.

On the Arab-Israeli conflict, Gorbachev cautioned that the fresh American Middle East peace plan which U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz is bringing with him to the region Wednesday is meant to break Israel's international isolation.

The plan, which is suggesting limited self-rule for Palestinians in the occupied territories to be followed by direct Arab-Israeli peace talks, is also designed to help the Jewish state survive the ongoing Palestinian uprising in the West Bank and Gaza, according to the Soviet leader's analysis.

On Afghanistan, Gorbachev reaffirmed Moscow's commitment to withdraw all Soviet troops from that Asian country, noting that such a move would help the Soviet Union devote more time to the other Middle East problems like the Gulf war and the Palestinians, AL-QABAS said.

In his messages to Arab leaders, Gorbachev pointed out that Pakistan was the only stumbling block in the face of a final settlement of the Afghan problem. He requested Arab countries to use their good offices with Pakistan as to persuade it to clear the way for the settlement in Afghanistan.

Pakistan, which is believed to be sheltering about two million Afghans who fled their country since the Soviet troops marched in late in 1979, was insisting that a national unity government be formed in Afghanistan before the signing of a final agreement on Soviet troop withdrawal. Moscow and the Soviet-backed government in Kabul have turned down Pakistan's condition.

According to the Kuwaiti newspaper the Kremlin leaders attach special importance to the role Saudi Arabia can play in breaking a stalemate.

Gorbachev's messages stressed that Moscow would continue to press for the convocation of an international conference on the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet leader sounded support for the Palestinian uprising and said it was an important development in the Middle East as it was putting pressures on Israel.

Algerian Leader Receives Gorbachev Message

LD232224 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Algiers February 23 TASS—President of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic Chadli Bendjedid today received Mikhail Sytenko, a special representative of the Soviet leadership, who handed over to the head of the state of Algeria the message of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on Afghanistan.

In the course of the talk the president expressed full support for the Soviet Union's initiative for a peace settlement of the Afghan problem. Questions of the present-day international situation, including regional conflicts and the situation in the Maghreb countries were also discussed.

The president highly assessed the Soviet-Algerian political and state relations at all levels and said that there were good prospects for their further development.

Tudeh Party CC Plenum Reelects Leader

PM241153 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Tudeh Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The newspaper NAMEH-YE MARDOM—the organ of the Tudeh Party Central Committee—has published a report on a recent Tudeh Party Central Committee plenum.

The report says that the plenum examined the situation in Iran and the international situation, and also determined the current political and organizational tasks facing the party in present conditions. The documents adopted by the plenum approved the course of uniting all the forces of Iranian society which advocate peace and freedom.

The plenum supported the new thinking in the sphere of international relations aimed at freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe and eliminating centers of tension throughout the world.

The party's leading organs were elected. 'Ali Khavari was re-elected first secretary of the Tudeh Party Central Committee.

Briefs

Afghan Electrical Equipment Contract

Kabul, 23 February (TASS)—A contract to supply Soviet equipment for the construction of a power transmission line and a substation in the region of Shir Khan port was signed here between the Afghan Ministry of Electrical Energy and the ali-union association Tekhnopromeksport. Putting this project into operation will help to bring electricity to populated points, and will also make it possible to build a power transmission line at the Kokcha Irrigation Complex, which is essential for the assimilation of new lands. Soviet technical assistance, which is given to Afghanistan on beneficial credit terms, promotes further economic development of the northern provinces of Afghanistan. [Text] [*Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 23 Feb 88 LD*]

Sri Lankan Exchange Protocol

Colombo February 22 TASS—A protocol on cultural and scientific exchanges between the USSR and Sri Lanka for 1988-1989 was signed here today in keeping with the March, 1972 bilateral Soviet-Sri Lankan agreement on cultural and scientific cooperation. The protocol provides for exchanges of groups of performers, delegations of writers and film-workers, exhibitions of canvases and works of applied art. Ties in the field of education, book-publishing, health service and archeology will be further developed. [Text] [*Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 22 feb 88 LD*]

East Europe

GDR Spokesman on 25 Feb Missile Withdrawal

LD240930 Moscow TASS in English 0250 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] Berlin 24 Feb TASS—The GDR News Agency ADN reports: The withdrawal of Soviet SS-12 missiles from Waren and Bischofswerda bases in the German Democratic Republic will begin tomorrow, Thursday, GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman Wolfgang Meyer has said.

These missiles had been deployed in the GDR and Czechoslovakia in response to the deployment of American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe in 1983.

The conclusion of the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty on scrapping American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe provided the prerequisite for the SS-12 withdrawal.

The recently announced measure will be carried out prior to the ratification of the INF Treaty by the USSR Supreme Soviet (Parliament) and the U.S. Congress.

Meyer underscored this step was renewed evidence of the constructive peace policy of the USSR, the GDR and the other socialist states. It is another concrete contribution to the early ratification of the historic Soviet-American treaty of 8 December 1987 and was designed to create favourable conditions for its implementation.

Gromyko, Nemeth Discuss 'Fruitful' Relations

LD231942 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Talks between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and Karoly Nemeth, MSZMP Central Committee Presidium chairman, were held in Budapest today. The sides conducted an in-depth exchange of opinions on the topical issues of socialist construction in the USSR and Hungary, and on the wide range of bilateral cooperation. A number of crucial international issues of mutual interest were discussed. The sides stated with satisfaction the fruitful nature of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in the political, economic, and humanitarian fields. Cooperation has been developing consistently and continuously on the basis of the accords reached in the course of meetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Janos Kadar, in the interests of the peoples of the two countries.

Comrades Gromyko and Nemeth stressed the determining nature of the antiwar, peaceful foreign policy lines of the USSR, Hungary, and other fraternal socialist countries for the destiny of the world.

The sides expressed their firm resolve to continue fostering unity and cohesion of the countries of the socialist community in the future, to perfect their cooperation in the framework of the Warsaw Pact, and to expand cooperation in the international arena in the interests of consolidating universal peace and security.

The talks passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere, typical of the fraternal relations of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Hungary.

Hungarian-USSR Ties 'Between Equals' Viewed

PM231629 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 88 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Kaverznev dispatch under the "Budapest Calling" rubric: "Lasting Ties Between Equals; Forty Years Since the Signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Between the USSR and Hungary"]

[Text] The Hungarian Republic only became known as the Hungarian People's Republic a year and a half after its birth. When the Hungarian delegation arrived in Moscow there was still in power in the country a coalition government, which included representatives of bourgeois parties. "By the act of concluding this treaty the Soviet Union was the first to recognize the new independent and free democratic Hungary born out of the ruins of the lost war and thereby placed it on a par with sovereign states enjoying equal rights. The Soviet Union was the the first great power which—for the first time in Hungarian history—treated our motherland as an equal partner and was ready to conclude a lasting alliance with it on the basis of equality." That, almost 20 years on, was how Comrade Janos Kadar assessed the treaty.

Let us look back over the last 40 years. How many events in Soviet-Hungarian relations and how many achievements there have been!

Contacts between our countries' party and state organs have strengthened. We have become allies and partners in the Warsaw Pact. Today we also recall 1956, when the Soviet Union, loyal to its commitments, gave the Hungarian working class selfless internationalist aid in crushing the counterrevolutionary revolt. Today our countries' positions on basic international problems are identical. Together with the other fraternal states, they advocate arms cuts and a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The two countries' public organizations actively cooperate. The Komsomol and the Hungarian Communist Youth League maintain traditionally friendly relations.

Our trade turnover has increased dozens of times over in 40 years. Some 150 industrial installations have been constructed or modernized in Hungary with Soviet technical assistance. We are rightly proud of the major joint projects carried out on a bilateral basis or with the participation of CEMA partners.

The Soviet Union is Hungary's main trading partner, accounting for more than 30 percent of its foreign trade turnover. If you trace the structural changes in trade between our countries, however, you are bound to notice the share of Soviet machinery and equipment in Soviet exports to Hungary has decreased from year to year while that of energy resources, raw materials, and semimanufactures have increased. Yet Hungary would be no less interested in obtaining modern equipment meeting world standards from the USSR. But for us, I think, it is uneconomical to pay for imports with oil, which has, moreover, sharply fallen in price in recent years. Although much is said about the need to develop production sharing, commodity exchange continues to prevail in our ties.

What is the solution? Specialists from both countries are working on ways to intensify our economic cooperation and are considering ways to increase the interest of enterprises, particularly Soviet ones, in foreign economic activity. New forms of cooperation are coming into being. Direct ties between around 90 pairs of enterprises have already been set up. But you can count on the fingers of one hand the examples where these ties are really effective. The first Soviet-Hungarian joint enterprises have been set up. Things are going well with some, but with others, including the very first, "Mikromed," there are great complications. The reasons are well known: Lack of experience and difficulties of an organizational nature, but the main obstacle is the disparity between the systems of internal price-fixing in each country. Would it not be worthwhile to combine the systems of price-fixing first and then set up direct ties? This standpoint has already been voiced, but a different opinion has prevailed: We cannot wait any longer, time is against us. It is necessary to "join battle" while resolving the problems that arise simultaneously. There have already been improvements, but the prospects are enormous.

USSR-CSSR Talks on Nuclear Power Cooperation

PM241207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] Prague, 22 Feb—Progress in implementing the program for the construction of nuclear power stations and heat supply stations in the CEMA countries through the year 2000, as well as questions of further developing cooperation in the machine-building sphere, were examined at a session of USSR and CSSR Government representatives held here today. The Soviet delegation was headed by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau on Machine-Building, while the CSSR side was headed by L. Gerle, CSSR deputy prime minister.

The delegations examined progress in the implementation of the accords reached during the talks held last November between N.I. Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, and L. Strougal, CSSR prime minister, and also exchanged information on the implementation of the accords reached during the talks in January this year between M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and M. Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary.

The delegations held a detailed discussion of questions of cooperation in nuclear power station construction in the CSSR and paid special attention to progress in building the "Mokhovtse" [name as published] and "Temelin" nuclear power stations. The sides also examined progress in the development of cooperation in the production of nuclear power station equipment.

The delegations discussed progress in the preparation of the joint prospectus of cooperation for a period of 15-20 years and the coordination of national economic plans for 1991-1995 in the sphere of machine-building and the electrical engineering industry. There was an examination of ministerial and departmental proposals aimed at further deepening cooperation in machine building and the electrical engineering industry, as well as a report on the activity of the Soviet-Czechoslovak "Robot" science and production association in Presov and the Skoda-Uralmash joint enterprise.

West Europe

Levin Views Kohl Remarks on U.S. Talks

LD231547 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Viktor Levin commentary from the "International Diary" program, presented by Aleksandr Korshunov]

[Text] [Korshunov] There is discussion in West Germany on the results of the visit to Washington by Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher. In the course of talks with the highest representatives of the U.S. Administration, matters of bilateral relations were discussed, as well as military problems, which will be put forth at the meeting of the leaders of the NATO member countries being convened on 2-3 March.

In an interview with the newspaper WELT AM SONNTAG, Chancellor Kohl devoted particular attention to prospects for further progress in disarmament and arms control in light of the Washington talks. He said that particular significance is being acquired by the limitation of conventional weapons in which, contended the head of the West German Government, the Warsaw Pact countries have superiority over NATO. We need, said the chancellor, to take the Soviet Union at their word and begin talks as soon as possible on limiting conventional weapons. The issue is, of course, an important one, but what does Kohl have in mind in speaking of the expediency of taking the Soviet Union at their word? I shall ask my colleague, Viktor Levin, to speak about this.

[Levin] The literal meaning of Kohl's words does not give rise to any doubt. He is raising the issue that it is essential to try to put into effect those proposals advanced by the Soviet Union for reducing conventional weapons and to achieve a substantial reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe. However, I would like to say that the Soviet Union and the other states comprising the Warsaw Pact, for the proposals mentioned by Kohl were elaborated by us jointly, not only have nothing against being taken, as the West German chancellor says, at our word; we have been insistently pressing for this for a long time. More than 2 years ago, the allied socialist states put forward a broad program for reducing the troop numbers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and subsequently not only detailed their proposals but also published a military doctrine of a precisely expressed defensive nature. However, there is still no clear reply to the specific proposals of the socialist states. If it should finally ensue in the near future, this will be cause only for rejoicing. I leave aside for the moment Kohl's assertion of the superiority of the conventional armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries. Very authoritative explanations have been given on this score on more than one occasion, and in the NATO countries themselves, major specialists confirm that there is no such superiority. If there are asymmetries in certain types of arms of the armed forces, then on this we have a quite precise proposal: to bring about equalization through reductions.

So, to return to Kohl's statement concerning the expediency of taking us at our word, I would like to say once more that we would like this very much. When it comes to other aspects of the Washington talks between the U.S. and FRG leaders, then in my view two problems, first and foremost, are of special note. These are the matter of the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons deployed on the territory of the FRG, and the matter of a total and global ban on chemical weapons. Judging from reports not only of the West German, but also the U.S. press, the approaches of the parties to these problems have turned out to be different. It is true that in official statements, the U.S. side also contends that there was no disagreement concerning the modernization of nuclear weapons. Washington and Bonn were united in the view that it is premature to speak about this at the moment. However, at the proper time, the matter will be discussed in the appropriate manner and will be resolved. I think that in this case the Americans thought it a good idea not to over-emphasize the disagreements and to put on a brave face. It is, after all, no secret that the Pentagon has been insisting on the speediest modernization of the Lance missiles located in the FRG, and Bonn has been resisting this. If mutual agreement now has been achieved that there is no need to rush, then one can speak of a certain degree of success for the West German position.

Although, and this also has to be noted, Chancellor Kohl stressed more than once while in Washington that he was a resolute opponent of the third zero, that is of the total elimination of tactical nuclear weapons on a reciprocal basis, and that he opposed the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, in this matter even the diplomatic formulation failed to conceal the disagreements. Bonn firmly favors the speediest conclusion of a treaty for a total and global ban on chemical weapons, but Washington recently has been openly leaning in the other direction. Kohl himself, while in the U.S. capital, said that he was meeting President Reagan for the ninth time and that there had always been full mutual understanding between them. On this occasion, however, I think that there was, in fact, no mutual understanding on all issues.

The FRG, in my view, has a deeper awareness of the significance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty for the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—Kohl, by the way, addressing Congress, urged senators to ratify this treaty—and in the interests of the true security of the country presses for new cardinal actions. This applies to their position with regard to a 50 percent reduction in the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the United States; this touches on the problem of eliminating chemical weapons. This also concerns reductions in conventional weapons. A full evaluation of Kohl's Washington talks can, I think, be made after the meeting of the leaders of the NATO powers, at which fundamental decisions are to be taken. Even now, however, there are grounds for concluding that Bonn does not take the position of an outside observer and plays an active role in the resolution of vital international problems. I consider that on a number of issues, this is a positive role.

Kohl Cited on Arms Issues

PM230931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 88 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "After the Talks"]

[Text] Bonn, 20 Feb—FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher have concluded their visit to Washington. The thing is, newspapers point out, that the FRG chancellor "managed to convince" President Reagan and his closest entourage of the need for NATO to formulate an integral concept in the sphere of disarmament and arms control, rejecting for the time being the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons.

H. Kohl expounded his program in Washington: the speediest ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles; the elaboration of an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms; the conclusion of an accord on a universal chemical weapons ban; the establishment of East-West equilibrium in the sphere of conventional arms in Europe; and a verified reduction in tactical nuclear weapons to the lowest possible level. The chancellor declared that the FRG is opposed to a "third zero" and the "denuclearization" of West Europe.

As a result of the talks, the U.S. side agreed that 88 Lance missiles, stationed chiefly in the FRG, do not need modernizing in any case before 1995.

However, U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci declared in a television speech that the Pentagon will nevertheless "continue to improve those kinds of weapons which it deems it necessary to modernize."

FRG Refuses To Extradite 'Nazi Butchers'

PM240859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Grishin "Letter From Bonn": "Harboring Nazis"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The West German authorities are in no hurry to respond to the Soviet Union's request for the extradition of 16 Nazi criminals who have found refuge in the FRG. The list of names of Hitler's murderers was given to President R. von Weizsaecker during his official visit to the Soviet Union last summer. We are talking about the following persons:

Wilhelm Westerheide—former regional commissar guilty of the mass murders of innocent people living in Volyn. The USSR Prosecutor's Office has provided FRG legal bodies with numerous pieces of evidence of Westerheide's complicity in evil crimes committed on Soviet territory. Thousands of tortured Soviet people are on his conscience. However, the Dortmund court ignored these documents and passed a verdict of not guilty in 1982.

Karl Kaufmann—former chief of gendarmery in the village of Srebnoye, Chernigov Oblast, who was personally involved in the annihilation of 680 Soviet citizens, including women and children. This war criminal has also evaded punishment and is living in freedom.

Aleksandr Yermolchik—responsible for the murders of 200 innocent people living in Gomel Oblast. This thug is now living under the name of Albert Krueger in the city of Zell (Lower Saxony). Six Soviet witnesses of Yermolchik's crimes have identified the murderer. Nevertheless, the FRG authorities are doing their utmost to drag out their investigation into the case.

Material sent to the FRG authorities 7 years ago on the crimes of former police officers Robert Braun, Arthur Kraft, Franz Frank, Jakob Schwenk, Ivan Fuhrer, Peter Schmidt, Eduard Schmierer, Ewald Simon, Mathias Karmann, Michael Scheftner, Albert Fechtner, and Ignats Sinyavskiy has still not been acted upon.

Not one of the criminals has been extradited to the Soviet Union. All these facts are evidence that the FRG authorities are clearly sheltering Nazi butchers.

Further on Visit of UK's Howe to Kiev

AU231514 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 18 Feb 88 p 3

[RATAU report: "British Minister's Visit"]

[Text] Late on 17 February G. Howe, British minister for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, arrived in the Ukraine's capital city. At Borispol Airport, with the flags of Great Britain, the USSR, and the Ukrainian SSR flying, he was welcomed by K.P. Boyko, affairs administrator of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers; V.A. Kravets, Ukrainian minister of foreign affairs; V.A. Zgurskiy, Kiev Gorispolkom chairman; and other officials.

On the following days, after a visit to the republic's Council of Ministers, the guest saw the M. Gorkiy automatic machines plant in Kiev. During a conversation in the plant management office, he was briefed on the enterprise and on the first results of work under the conditions of economic accountability and self-financing. The foreign minister inquired about the effects of restructuring on working conditions and social problems. During the tour of shops, G. Howe talked with workers.

In the Eternal Glory Park, the British minister for foreign and Commonwealth affairs laid a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and a minute of silence tribute was paid to the memory of Soviet soldiers who fell in the battles for the liberation of the homeland from the Hitlerite occupiers, for the freedom of the peoples of Europe.

G. Howe met with the exarch of the Ukraine, metropolitan of Kiev and Galich Filaret, and visited the St. Vladimir's Cathedral.

The guest toured the city, seeing the architectural and historical sights.

On 17 February, on behalf of the Ukrainian SSR Government, a luncheon was given in honor of the British foreign minister and his spouse.

On the same day G. Howe left Kiev for London. At the airport he was seen off by K.P. Boyko, affairs administrator of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers; V.A. Kravets, Ukrainian minister of foreign affairs; V.A. Zgurskiy, Kiev Gorispolkom chairman; and N.N. Uspenskiy, Second European Department chief in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Also seeing him off was Bryan Cartledge, British ambassador to the USSR.

Meets Ukrainian Officials

AU231515 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 18 Feb 88 p 3

[RATAU report: "A Conversation in the Ukrainian Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On an unofficial visit to our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government, G. Howe, British minister for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, had a meeting in the Ukrainian Council of Ministers on 17 February. M.A. Orlik, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman, briefed the visitor on the history of the Ukrainian SSR and on the social and cultural development achievements of its people. During the conversation, it was noted that in the Ukraine and throughout the Soviet Union, a renewal was now taking place in all spheres of society's life: Democratization and glasnost have been widely unfolded; the rights of union republics, local authorities, and labor collectives have been expanded. The management of the national economy is moving toward radical economic methods based on switching over enterprises and associations to full economic accountability and self-financing.

M.A. Orlik emphasized that the Soviet people are also associated with restructuring the positive changes that have taken place in the international situation recently. First, there was the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed between the USSR and the United States of America during the Washington summit. Like all Soviet people, the Ukraine's working people are interested in peace and are doing their utmost to preserve and to strengthen it.

We share your striving for peace, G. Howe said. Having noted great interest in the changes taking place in the Soviet Union, he said in particular: M.S. Gorbachev's book on restructuring is being read in all countries with great interest. The word "perestroyka," unknown until recently, is being used outside the USSR. We think that many ideas described in this book are being realized. It is good that the processes of decentralization are taking place, that the principle of material motivation is being encouraged, and that other changes are in progress. We welcome prospects for raising the Soviet people's prosperity. We would also like to see big opportunities for expanding trade between our two countries, for tourism. This is very good for the cause of peace.

Participating in the conversation were K.P. Boyko, affairs administrator of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers; V.A. Kravets, Ukrainian minister of foreign affairs; Yu.A. Olenenko, Ukrainian minister of culture; N.A. Kolesnik, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs under the Ukrainian Council of Ministers; and N.N. Uspenskiy, Second European Department chief in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Bryan Cartledge, British ambassador to the USSR, was present during the conversation.

Leader of Portuguese Socialist Party Reelected

LD211844 Moscow TASS in English 1828 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] Lisbon February 21 TASS—The Seventh Congress of the Portuguese Socialist Party, the biggest opposition party of the country, ended in Lisbon today. The delegates made changes in the party's regulations and elected the party's leading bodies. Vitor Manuel Ribeiro Constancio was reelected general secretary of the Socialist Party. The resolution adopted by the majority of votes emphasizes the refusal from compromise with Portugal's Conservative Party and expresses the socialists' intention to wage the struggle against the ruling Social-Democratic Party. The congress was attended by representatives of more than 30 countries, among them the delegation of the CPSU.

Finnish President, Kovalev Discuss Relations

LD231858 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Helsinki February 23 TASS—President of the Republic of Finland Mauno Koivisto has received Anatoliy Kovalev, personal representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, who came to Helsinki.

They discussed important questions of Soviet-Finnish cooperation and development of contacts, a number of topical international problems. The president was provided with the Soviet leadership's information on the results of the recent negotiations with the U.S. secretary of state in Moscow.

The president of Finland was informed of the main content of the February (1988) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. The talk was constructive and held in a friendly atmosphere.

Political & Social

Armenians Demonstrate in Nagorno-Karabakh

Politburo Decision Protested

AU231357 Paris AFP in English 1330 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, Feb 23 (AFP)—Some 120,000 demonstrators took to the streets of the Armenian capital Yerevan on Tuesday in a groundswell of anger over Monday's decision by the Politburo not to return Karabakh to Armenia, according to dissident sources. [passage omitted]

Overnight 70,000 protestors marched through Yerevan chanting slogans to protest the Central Politburo's decision not to give in to their demand, according to Armenians contacted by dissident Alexander Ogordnikov in Moscow.

They said the street protests had been going on for a week, but so far without incident.

Protests Becoming 'Nationalist'

AU231342 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1100 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Franz Koessler report]

[Excerpt] Mount Ararat, on which Noah landed with his ark according to the legend, is the landmark of Armenia. But the snow-covered peak is hardly ever visible from the capital. The air has been polluted by a chemical factory in the city area. Now that a rubber factory is also to be established near Yerevan, the inhabitants have vented their anger.

A protest rally was held at the Yerevan Opera, and then demonstrations were staged in front of the official building of the Council of Ministers in the city's main square. This happened last Friday [19 February]. Since then calm has not been restored in Yerevan. Information that reaches Moscow via dissident circles is scarce. The reports speak of increasing rallies in which thousands of people take part. Police have not intervened, and the local authorities are trying to establish a dialogue with the demonstrators.

In the course of events, however, the nature of the protests has changed. Nationalist slogans are being heard. Yesterday, for instance, under the slogan "One nation, one republic," a large crowd of protesters called for the reintegration of Karabakh into the Armenian Republic. Karabakh is a small area the size of Burgenland [Austrian province] which is inhabited by 150,000 citizens. Most of them are Armenians. The area itself was incorporated into the Azerbajan Soviet Republic in 1923. National tensions had so far been unknown, but recently difficulties have surfaced. Army and militia have allegedly been increased in the small autonomous region.

The Armenians in the neighboring republic are following the development with great attention. The announcement that the competent authorities in Moscow had rejected the concept of the reunification between Armenia and Karabakh was sufficient for kindling the nationalist spark in Armenia as well. [passage omitted]

Party Urges End to Dispute

LD231532 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 23 TASS—Part of the Armenian population in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region, the Soviet transcaucasian republic of Azerbaijan, advanced recently demands that Nagorno-Karabakh be included into the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Breaching of public order was provoked as a result of irresponsible calls by extremist individuals.

Having examined the information about developments in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region, the CPSU Central Committee holds that the actions and demands directed at revising the existing national and territorial structure contradict the interests of the working people in Soviet Azerbaijan and Armenia and damages interethnic relations.

Being consistently guided by Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, the CPSU Central Committee has appealed to patriotic and internationalist feelings of the Armenian and Azerbaijani population urging it not to yield to provocations by nationalist elements but to strengthen in all ways the great heritage of socialism—fraternal friendship of the Soviet ethnic groups.

The CPSU Central Committee instructed the central committees of the Communist Parties of Azerbaijan and Armenia to undertake necessary measures for improving the existing situation, to direct all means of political and ideological influence to explain the Leninist nationalities policy, its essence at the current stage.

All work should proceed from the premise that the nationalities issue demands close and constant attention to national peculiarities, psychology and consideration for the vital interests of the working people.

It was suggested that the party and local government bodies in the republics normalize the situation relating to Nagorno-Karabakh, safeguard public order and strict observance of socialist laws, work out and carry out measures for the further socio-economic and cultural development of the autonomous region.

Armenian Request 'Irresponsible'

LD232013 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Baku February 23 TASS—The attempts by individuals in Nagorno-Karabakh to justify their demands for the incorporation of that region into neighbouring Armenia, a Soviet republic in Transcaucasia, by its alleged economic backwardness compared to Azerbaijan (another Soviet republic in Transcaucasia) are irresponsible, a senior local government official pointed out today.

Ayaz Mutalibov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers in Azerbaijan, of which the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region is part, told a TASS correspondent:

"In many areas of the national economy, Nagorno-Karabakh, in which Armenians make up the majority, is noticeably ahead of the average indicators in the entire republic.

"Industrial output more than trebled in the region over the past 15 years. Nagorno-Karabakh plays an important role in the economy of entire Azerbaijan and is closely connected with all its other regions.

"They send to Nagorno-Karabakh various equipment, metal articles, building materials, fuel and energy resources, raw materials and consumer goods.

"In turn, the autonomous region supplies electrical fixtures, silk fabric, musical instruments and foodstuffs."

Food and light industries were developing especially fast in the autonomous region, Mutalibov said. Machine-building accounted for more than 80 per cent of industrial production. Branches of several Azerbaijani industrial enterprises were being set up in the region.

Mutalibov drew attention to the extensive programme of Nagorno-Karabakh's social development, including housing construction. "There are more kindergartens, hospital beds and libraries per capita of its population compared to an average in Azerbaijan."

"Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Russians and other ethnic groups live in friendship in Nagorno-Karabakh.

"The region's interests have never been infringed in any way. Its rights are guaranteed by the USSR Constitution," Mutalibov pointed out in conclusion.

Razumovskiy Addresses Activists

LD241047 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] (?The) meeting of the party activists in the Caucasian region of Karabakh has approved the evaluation of the situation in this autonomous area given by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. The Central Committee has called for normalizing the situation and consolidating the friendship between nations. The autonomous region was formed in 1923 as part of Azerbaijan. It is situation not far from the Soviet Republic of Armenia and is populated by 49 different nationalities, including a considerable number of Armenians. [sentence as heard] Lately some extremists have been demanding joining Karabakh to Armenia instead of Azerbaijan. Meetings with such demands were held in Stepanakert, Nakhichevan, and Agdam. The Central Committee (?finds) that those claims contravene the interests of both republics and harm their relations. A secretary of the Central Committee, Georgiy Razumovskiy, has stated at a meeting of the party activists in Karabakh that the extremists' activities can lead to serious consequences if responsible measures are not taken against them. There are many unsolved problems in the economic and cultural life of the region, but they ought to be solved in a businesslike way and not by a revision of the national and territorial status.

'Nationalist' Protests Continue

AU241059 Paris AFP in English 1042 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, Feb 24 (AFP)—Nationalist demonstrations continued Wednesday in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, but there were no reports of clashes, local sources reached by telephone told AFP.

The demonstrators are calling for the return to Armenia of a region which was attached to neighboring Azerbaijan under Stalin.

Yerevan inhabitants contacted by telephone from Moscow said there had been no clashes Wednesday between police and the demonstrators. They did not specify the size of the demonstration. [passage omitted]

Situation Outlined

OW241153 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 24 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] In relation to Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast. Part of the Armenian population in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR over the past few days has demanded the inclusion of the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast into the Armenian SSR.

As the result of irresponsible calls of individual extremists, breaches of public order were provoked. The CPSU Central Committee, after studying the available information about the events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, feels that the actions and demands directed at review of the national-territorial structure contradicts the interests of the working people of the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's, and causes harm to inter-ethnic relations.

Having been consistently guided by the Leninist principles of ethnic policies, the CPSU Central Committee has appealed to the patriotic and international feelings of the Armenian and Azerbaijani people with the call not to bow to the provocations of the nationalist elements but to strengthen, by all means at their disposal, the great heritage of socialism and the fraternal friendship of the Soviet peoples.

The CPSU Central Committee entrusted the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Azerbaijan and Armenia to take the necessary measures to improve the present situation and to direct all means of political and ideological influence to explain the Leninist nationalities policy and its essence at the present stage.

All work should proceed from the premise that the nationalities question demands close and constant attention to the national peculiarities, psychology, and considerations for the vital interests of the working people.

It was suggested to the party and local government bodies to normalize the situation relating to Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast, to ensure public order and the strict adherence of socialist legalities, work out and implement measures for the further social, economic and cultural development of the autonomous oblast.

Reports on Baltic 'Independence' Days Observed

Estonian 'Extremists' Criticized

LD231849 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 23 TASS—TASS correspondent Viktor Maatis writes:

Hardly a month passed by since the "proclamation" of the formation of the so-called "Estonian National Independence Party", as its leaders greeom Eke-Paert Nymm [name as received] and criminal Vello Vaertnyu, who was under trial for the illegal attempt of crossing the USSR's state frontier, moved to Sweden for a permanent place of residence. This was reported to the TASS correspondent at Soviet Estonia's Foreign Ministry.

Who are now in the so-called party claiming the role of "defenders and plenipotentiary representatives" of the Estonian people? Just as the Latvian group "Helsinki-86", the core of its initiative group are nationalist-minded extremists of little education. Heiki Ahonen, Mati Jijrend, Kaliu Mattik, Endel Ratas, Erik Udam were called to account, as criminals, according to Estonia's Procurator's Office.

Estonian historian Aksel Mannik, assessing the programme of that anti-Soviet-minded group, said that "its members are camouflaging the real aims under the slogans of public openness and perestroyka now popular in the USSR. They propose for instance that the economy be transferred from extensive to intensive development. But this is exactly the way outlined by the Communist Party of Estonia. They insist on perfecting the system of elections, but government agencies are now engaged exactly in that question. They believe that it is necessary to resolve ecological problems, but is it not the result of the nationwide discussion that development of phosphorite deposits was stopped in Estonia?" In actual fact, the historian says, "The group of extremists are motivated by a narrow, nationalist idea. They demand, for instance, that Estonian citizenship be granted only to the people who were Estonian citizens before August 6, 1940 and their descendants. All people who came to live in Estonia after the restoration of Soviet power in the republic ought to be considered foreign workers without political rights." In the opinion of Aksel Mannik, the group of political adventurists "lacks responsibility to the Estonian people on behalf of which it is trying to appear. These people insult the working people of the republic, irrespective of their nationality".

"There is a sufficient number of problems which should be discussed and resolved in Estonia", Mannik said in conclusion. "Any viewpoint is now welcome in our society, if it stems from the only possible reality for the Estonian people: to continue developing as a socialist nation".

Estonians Protest U.S. 'Meddling'

LD231602 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 23 TASS—The attempts made by U.S. congressmen at picturing the bloody terror campaign unleashed by the German occupation troops and the bourgeois nationalists against Estonia's working people in February 1918 as triumph of "independence" strike by their cynicism and are a source of well-founded indignation, a TASS correspondent was told by Harri Lumi, the mayor of Tallinn, the capital of Soviet Estonia.

He said that the party and government bodies are receiving on these days numerous letters from the working people protesting against the meddling of the Western political figures into Soviet Estonia's home affairs. Tens of work collectives, representatives of intellectuals, students and schoolchildren have expressed the intention to participate in mass protest actions.

The city authorities, Harri Lumi said, have decided to hold on February 24 a city rally. It will be held in Victory Square, the traditional venue of rallies and demonstrations by the inhabitants of the Estonian capital. According to preliminary figures, several thousand persons will take part in it. The mayor of Tallinn said that the necessary measures will be taken for organizing the rally and ensuring the observance of public order. Thus, in particular, the parking of cars in Victory Square will be

prohibited in the course of the mass demonstrations and public merry-making. The trolleybus stop will be transferred to another place. No other restrictions on the city traffic are envisaged.

Harri Lumi said that a certain Eric Udam, earlier convicted for anti-Soviet activities, Eve Pyarnaste and Yarvi Orula, as well as Vello Vyaertnyu and Eke-Pyart Nymm, who moved to Sweden for permanent residence, had turned to the city authorities for a permit for the holding of a "meeting" on the same day. Judging by the contents of their applications, the mayor said, the event which they were planning would be of a nationalist and extremist character. Therefore, in keeping with the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (parliament) of Estonia "on meetings, rallies, street marches and other events organized on the initiative of the citizens" the city soviet has denied them permission for holding a meeting.

Estonians Commemorate 1918 Battle

LD232018 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 23 TASS—TASS correspondent Ralf Amos reports:

It was not easy to find a parking place for a car near the small town of Keila near the capital of Estonia. Thousands of residents of that Soviet Baltic republic gathered here today for ceremony of unveiling a memorial to commemorate the Red Army men who lost their lives here 70 years ago in a battle against Kaiser invaders.

"The Keila battle was the first battle of the first formation of the Estonian Red Army", the TASS correspondent has been told by historian Edgar Mattizen. "It is exactly the Red Army that gave a proper rebuff to the German invaders who approached Tallinn on February 22, 1918". On that day, the historian recalled, Tallinn Red Armymen headed by Viktor Kingisepp formed units with a strength of up to 400 men. The February 23 Keila battle made it possible to hold up the invaders for 24 hours and that enabled evacuation of state institutions from Tallinn, and what is the main thing, the Baltic fleet was taken out of the harbour and saved.

"The working lads lost their lives, defending the capital of Estonia, and local bourgeoisie prohibited Estonian residents to put up resistance to the kaiser men", said Erich Tint, a veteran of the Second World War, who was a witness of a Keila battle. His adolescent years fell for the years of the bourgeois rule. "Only a person absolutely devoid of patriotism and national pride can describe as a 'national holiday' the February days of 1918 when Tallinn fell into the hands of the invaders. My family knew what bourgeois liberties are: One could not afford a doctor. The work was only for 'reliable' people and there was not always enough bread to eat. Is it for such unity of the people and prosperity of the nation that they call us for from over the seas?".

"The links between the generations residents [as received] of Soviet Estonia are much stronger than think those who left the homeland scores of years ago, and now pose as Estonian patriots", said Keila teacher Aivar Pyldvee, leader of the local section of the "Society for the Protection of Antique Monuments". "We revere the memory of those who paid with their lives for our right to develop culture and traditions, to speak and write in their native language whoever they are by nationality, they are heroes of history, of socialist Estonia".

Estonian Historians Meet

LD232245 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Tallinn February 23 TASS—TASS correspondent Leo Kallis writes:

Noted Estonian historian Professor Edgar Mattizen has described the two-year period, from February 1918 to March 1920, as a tragic period in the history of his people. Five war conflicts took place on Estonia's territory over these 25 months, he recalled in his speech at the conference "Estonia in 1917-1920" which was held here Monday evening.

The professor noted the revolutionary character of the Estonian proletariat in Autumn 1917. He recalled that Soviet power was proclaimed in Tallinn 24 hours after the victory of the October Revolution in Petrograd. But German troops intruded there late in February 1918.

Speaking at the conference, Professor Toomas Kariaharm, touched upon the proclamation of a bourgeois republic in Estonia, and noted that it became possible by the invasion of German troops. On February 24, when evacuation of Soviet institutions was already under way, Estonian bourgeoisie proclaimed the so-called "independence of Estonia" which existed for less than 24 hours. Decrees of the commander in chief of the Eighth German Army Count Kirchbach left no trace of that independence. 5,000 people were arrested and many of them executed in the very first days of the occupation.

After the November revolution in Germany in 1918, said historian Hannes Valter, when the occupation troops were compelled to leave Estonia, a civil war broke out. At that time the Estland labour community existed in the north-eastern part and a bourgeois republic—in the western part. Finnish, Danish and Swedish units, Russian White Guard troops were in a hurry to help the bourgeoisie. A British squadron was in the roadstead of Tallinn. Soviet power was strangled in Estonia through the joint efforts of bourgeois nationalists and interventionists, the scholar said. Meanwhile, units of the bourgeois army were fighting against the corps of the Baltic-German nobility who were seeking to restore in the Baltic the power of German barons, said Hannes Valter. After the downfall of the Estland labour community in June, 1919, bourgeois Estonia with the support of White

Guard formations waged war against the young Soviet Russia. It ended only in 1920 with the signing of the Tartu Peace Treaty, it was noted at the conference.

The discussion involved members of the so-called "Estonian Group to Make Public the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact". One of them, Kaliu Mattik lamented that the history of bourgeois Estonia's war against formations of Baltic barons has not yet been published in Soviet Estonia. In reply, Hannes Valter said that a book on the history of that war was being prepared for publication in Tallinn.

Provocations in Lithuania Scored

LD231546 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Vilnius February 23 TASS—Despite the failure of attempts to provoke anti-Soviet provocations in Lithuania on February 16, some Western reporters, assisted by reactionary Lithuanian emigres, have been inventing stories about how that day has passed.

A special zeal in this kind of activity has been demonstrated by Algirdas Klimajtis, a spokesman for the U.S.-based so-called Main Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania who is the son of a war criminal and organizer of anti-Jewish pogroms.

This is why it is appropriate to return to the day of February 16 and the events preceding it.

In connection with President Reagan's proclamation of "Lithuanian Independence Day", certain forces in the West were instigating Lithuanian people to stage disturbances. The same goal was served by a resolution of U.S. Congress and an official statement by the U.S. President.

Among other measures, Radio Vatican, for instance, broadcast a semi-anonymous address from extremists, saying it had been signed by 41 people. Part of the alleged "signatories", however, strongly deny they have signed it.

Far from achieving their objective, the efforts of the instigators have only drawn an opposite reaction from Lithuanian people. Some 800 rallies were held in protest against outside meddling in Lithuania's domestic affairs.

A total of 92,000 people took part in those protests. A rally in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius was attended by 15,000 people rather than 2,000 as reported by Western radio stations.

Speakers at the rallies were unanimous that it is only the Soviet system of power that has given the Lithuanian nation a free life and restored its statehood.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (parliament) and other state agencies and mass organizations have been receiving angry letters from people feeling insulted by a foreign government having the temerity to teach the Lithuanians how they should live.

The letters have been signed by a total of 61,000 people living in Lithuania.

The deputies of its Supreme Soviet have described the U.S. Administration's calls as a "hostile act" and "flagrant interference in the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian people".

Senior priests of the Lithuanian Catholic Church said at a meeting with the parliamentary leaders of Lithuania that the church rejects foreign attempts to use it for political purposes and dissociated themselves from the address by extremists circulated in the West.

On February 16, Shrove Tuesday, evening services were held in Lithuanian Catholic churches and the number of worshippers was not larger than usual. In some places, however, extremists attempted to misuse the services for political ends, but this aroused the indignation of the believers.

Militia detained 32 persons throughout Lithuania on those days for hooliganism and violations of public order, which, incidentally, had nothing to do with the extremists' calls. The number is even lower than usual.

The intended ideological act of subversion against Soviet Lithuania has thus flopped. The Lithuanian people have demonstrated once again their inflexible will to proceed along the chosen path.

They will celebrate the 70th anniversary of their true statehood on December 16 this year, on the day when Soviet power was proclaimed in Lithuania.

Kazakh Scholar Criticizes Erroneous Nationalism

PM181525 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by N. Dzhandildin, corresponding member of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Unequivocal Conversation": "On the Matter of Injured National Feeling"; boldface as published—first paragraph is KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "The Nationalities Question and the System for the Management of Society"—this was the title of a manuscript by S. Adenov which he offered to our newspaper for publication. In our opinion, S. Adenov presents the questions of the development of national relations in the country with bias and from mistaken positions. Holding that his own viewpoint is the only correct one, the author rejects all others. We asked N.

Dzhandildin, corresponding member of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences, for his comments on the manuscript. There is a special reason for a public and unequivocal conversation.

While working on these notes, I was guided by interest in the truth on the fundamental issues raised in the manuscript, because much in it has been distorted beyond recognition.

Let us begin with the essence of the first group of issues as presented by S. Adenov. In the conditions of socialism, he emphasizes, the fundamental basis for manifestations of nationalism is provided by the great-power chauvinism whose spirit supposedly imbues the "bureaucratic apparatus of management," which pursues a "great-power policy" toward all nations except the largest. Small-nation nationalism can be engendered only as a reaction in response to this policy. The main bearer of such nationalism is the intelligentsia (writers, artists, scientists, and others) which, in the author's words, "is fed by the people's labor but through the management apparatus, and most of its members are therefore 'professional lackeys' of the ruling clique." In his belief, the beginning of all calamities in this social sphere was marked by the "abolition" of the term "great-power chauvinism" back in the thirties (the only thing that is unknown is by whom!) and its replacement by the term "chauvinism." What S. Adenov wants to say is that simple chauvinism can be displayed by any "ordinary" nation in relations with other and numerically smaller peoples. But great-power chauvinism is taken to mean only Russian chauvinism, which supposedly has always been and still remains the chief and most dangerous evil. Hence the unambiguous conclusion that the main condition for overcoming all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism is to eliminate "great-power," in other words Russian, chauvinism. This is what the manuscript's author thinks, this is what he frankly writes. Moreover, he dogmatically cites Lenin and party documents left, right, and center, frequently and mechanically taking any "suitable" phrases out of context. The final result gives the impression that the aforementioned stunning conclusions belong not to the manuscript's author but to V.I. Lenin and fully conform with the party's stipulations on the nationalities question.

Dogmatic treatment of the theoretical heritage of the classics of Marxism-Leninism is as a rule the consequence of, on the one hand, total ignorance and lack of understanding of the actual creatively-transforming essence of their great teaching and, on the other hand, of a deliberate desire to conceal the inconsistency of one's own views beneath quotations from this heritage, banking on other people's ignorance and lack of understanding. In this instance we are dealing with the effect of both causes, with a clear preference for deliberately ignoring the fact that some statements by the classics on specific issues, while correct in certain historical conditions, cannot be applied to an evaluation of those same issues in different and changed conditions.

Nationalism in any of its forms (be it great-power or local nationalism, the nationalism of a large or small nation) is not an immanent feature of nations, as our author obviously believes. Prior to the revolution it was engendered by national inequality and the oppression of one nation by another, which in turn were direct consequences of social inequality and the exploitation of one class by another. Tsarism, the capitalists, and the land owners—being economically and politically interested in the oppression of "non-Russians" [inorodtsi]—applied the "divide and rule" principle, deliberately encouraged splittism, chauvinism, and nationalism, and cultivated mistrust and enmity among peoples. As for great-power attitudes, they were an expression of the sense of superiority of this clique of exploiters who really lorded it over all the peoples within the "great power" (also known as the prison of peoples) including, of course, the Russian nation. In those conditions this variety of chauvinism performed just one function—the function of protecting the class interests of a handful of exploiters and the social mainstays of tsarism and the bourgeois-land ownership system. It was profoundly alien to the fundamental interests and the spirit of the vast exploited majority of the Russian people.

Nationalism, when ascribed to small nations, also had a strictly class nature and expressed the primordial desires and aspirations of the bourgeoisie and other rich strata of these nations to draw apart and isolate "their" peoples, to tear them away from Russia so as to enjoy independent and complete sway over their fate. During the post-October period, and especially during the civil war, it had a clearly manifest anti-Soviet thrust and was therefore hostile to the genuine aspirations of the broad working masses, an enemy of their social freedom.

The early twenties raised in all its magnitude the question of rallying all formerly oppressed peoples around the Soviet power, of creating a voluntary union of nations which, in V.I. Lenin's words, "would rule out any violence by one nation against another, a union which would be based on the fullest possible trust, on clear awareness of fraternal unity, and on fully voluntary agreement" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 40 p 43). A serious obstacle in the way of solving this historic task was the heavy burden of mistrust toward everything Russian, the inheritance of centuries of national oppression. What was needed was a wise Leninist approach to this complex and highly delicate question, an approach ruling out any attacks, assaults, or pressure which could fan this mistrust anew or harm the noble work which had been initiated. Our experience in the solution of the nationalities question over a 5-year period, V.I. Lenin wrote, "has firmly convinced us that only tremendous consideration for the interests of different nations eliminates any ground for conflict, eliminates mutual mistrust, eliminates the fear of any intrigues, and creates the trust—especially among workers and peasants speaking different languages—without which peaceful relations between peoples and even the slightest development of

everything valuable in contemporary civilization are absolutely impossible" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 45 p 240).

In these specific historical conditions a particular danger was posed by great-Russian nationalism (chauvinism), which was capable of dividing the workers and working masses of different nationalities and of seriously harming the cause of winning their trust in the Russian proletariat and the Soviet system. At that time it was displayed in the outlying national regions by individual officials who were, as a rule, either recent converts from the bourgeois-land owning circle who had not yet successfully cast off the habits of former great-power ambitions or alien elements who had accidentally found their way into the party-soviet apparatus.

It is therefore understandable and natural that V.I. Lenin, being an unsurpassed master in applying the methods of materialist dialectics to the analysis and solution of nationalities problems, should at that moment launch a struggle against none other but great-Russian chauvinism. His words are famous: "I declare war on great-Russian chauvinism, a war to the death" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 45 p 240).

S. Adenov has literally latched on to this idea of Lenin's which was dictated by the tactics of the struggle against deviations in the nationalities question in certain historical conditions and, by absolutizing it, has taken it to the point of absurdity: Apparently the actual nature of great-Russian chauvinism has not changed in the least over the last 65 years (?!!).

He draws another conclusion in support of his own view, which is far removed from Lenin's view on this question, from Lenin's demand to display particular tact and attentiveness toward the interests, culture, and traditions of small formerly oppressed nations and to be more tractable with regard to their national feelings. According to him, there is no need at all to wage any struggle against local nationalism since the only method to overcome it is to struggle against great-power chauvinism. And without the slightest pang of conscience, he ascribes this narrowly nationalistic idea to Lenin.

Yet Lenin, while persistently demanding that people be "1,000 times careful" and even tractable when it came to eliminating the mistrust of formerly oppressed peoples in Soviet power, did not even think of the possibility of concessions on the party's principled line on the nationalities question or the struggle against manifestations of nationalism of any hue or form.

After socialism became a reality, the exploiting classes were liquidated, and the multinational Soviet people developed into a new social and international community of people, the main causes which engendered chauvinism and nationalism in the forms and varieties in which they manifested themselves in the conditions of class antagonism disappeared. The nature of both deviations changed, and the forms of their manifestations altered.

Nationalist deviationism (chauvinism and nationalism) in socialist society has a number of fundamental aspects which distinguish it from nationalist deviationism in the conditions of prerevolutionary reality.

One of these aspects in our view is the following: Previously the main bearers of chauvinism and nationalism were primarily the exploiting classes and the social groups closely linked with them. The virus of these "-isms" could infect only individual socially and morally unstable people among the working classes. But now the bearers of both deviations are exclusively individuals who do not constitute any socially organized force.

There is another aspect: Previously nationalist deviationism expressed the interests and moods of a certain class inside the country which was vitally interested in ensuring that this "-ism" becamw a nationwide phenomenon and produced the best possible "returns" for this class. Now, however, it is not backed by any class or other socially determined group and therefore does not express anybody's interests or sentiments, but at the same time it does act as some sort of actual negative force which causes great harm to the cause of strengthening the Soviet peoples' fraternal unity and friendship. This is why our ideological adversaries and the enemies of socialism are profoundly interested in seeing it penetrate the awareness and mentality of as many Soviet people as possible.

The claim by the manuscript's author that great-power chauvinism is rooted exclusively in the "bureaucratic apparatus of management" and is encouraged by it is nothing but totally groundless demagoguery with a substantial added dose of slander against the party, soviet, Komsomol, trade union, and other apparatus. It is no secret at all that the management apparatus in our country is far from perfect and that it is currently in the process of being fundamentally cleansed of bureaucratism, social injustice, bribery, nepotism, mutual protectionism, fraud, window dressing, and other antisocial phenomena which grew firm roots during the period of stagnation. Nonetheless, only someone who is downright ignorant in matters of theory and practice and simultaneously a malicious nationalist who has lost all sense of control over his extremely distorted feelings could ascribe the disease of great-power chauvinism to the entire management apparatus of Soviet society. This is an unhealthy calumny against the national intelligentsia of Soviet peoples and a rather free-and-easy description of it as "professional lackeys" of the ruling clique. The author displays a lack of the most elementary logic here. On the one hand, the entire "bureaucratic apparatus of management" is, in his view, imbued with great-power chauvinism while, on the other hand, in order to please

that same apparatus, the intelligentsia of every non-Russian nation plays the role of bearer of nationalism! Here we have someone who has really lost his way!

Manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism are certainly to be encountered in our reality, and they do not materialize out of thin air. But it is not socialism as we imagine its ideal form that engenders them, even though it is hard to deny a certain link between these deviations and the distortions that are at times produced by life. In a socialist society they take the form of remnants of the past in the minds of the most conservative section of the population. But they do have the ability to spring back to life from time to time, acting as parasites on the growth of national awareness which is the natural consequence of the comprehensive flourishing of the country's nations and ethnic groups. The point is that the growth of national awareness, unless its progress is constantly monitored and unless it is channeled along the required ideological-political track, is fraught with possible negative consequences. There is, for example, the possibility of a certain alienation between national and international feelings, the idealization of the people's historical past, the diminution of the importance of their socialist gains made jointly with other peoples, the limitation of objects of national pride to the framework of the historical and cultural values of only the prerevolutionary epoch, the substitution of "planetary" positions for class positions, which is essentially the reverse side of the coin known as the "nation" concept, and so on.

We are, of course, not saying that every one of these ideas and views, which are mistaken from an internationalist viewpoint, leads to nationalism or chauvinism. Anyone is liable to make a mistake in something and at some point. One cannot rule out the possibility of making a mistake in assessing some phenomenon or other in national life or international relations. But there are mistakes and mistakes. Some commit mistakes at a theoretical and methodological level through ignorance of the real dialectics of the complex interaction of social processes. Others commit mistakes at the level of everyday awareness, falling victim to old prejudices and philistine ideas. The mistakes made by yet others are of the nature of political concepts, based on beliefs and committed deliberately and for a definite purpose.

Our scientific-theoretical arsenal contains ideas and corresponding terms to express them, like "national narrow-mindedness," "national arrogance," "national exclusiveness," and so on. Not knowing the different meanings of each one of these terms and unable to make proper use of them, we often reduce them to a common denominator and rather easily resort to "solid" terms like "nationalism" and "chauvinism."

A blanket and loud accusation of "-ism" leveled against all and sundry, as the author of the manuscript under review does, generates natural protest and deserves the harshest condemnation.

Therefore, considerable importance in the question of working people's international education attaches to clear distinctions between people who commit different mistakes in their views on certain aspects of national relations, national cultures, and so on, and the real nationalists and chauvinists who deliberately act to harm the cause of strengthening the Soviet peoples' fraternal unity and friendship.

If we have someone who has honest socialist beliefs in his views on his people's life, history, and culture but does not go beyond the national framework and remains strictly "on national soil," as it were, in everything and in all circumstances while not setting his people in opposition to others and without feeling any hatred or mistrust for other peoples, his social nature and behavior ought to be described as nationally limited and not in any way nationalist.

In cases when a representative of a numerically greater nation or a nation with a richer historical past who, as a consequence of his lack of education and not through deliberate malice, looks down on or looks disrespectfully on people of other nationalities, having claimed for himself the "right" to civilize them, and is biased in overemphasizing the values, attributes, and merits of his own nation, we are dealing with an obvious manifestation of national arrogance.

It also happens that someone is called upon to strictly observe the principles of equality of nations and national justice in his practical work but, if all other factors remain equal, he gives preference to his own nation, places its interests above the interests of other nations, and applies all his energy to secure some advantages for it at the expense of other nations, this kind of behavior is correctly called national egoism.

Any manifestation of nationalist deviationism exerts a negative influence on ideologically immature people and hampers the molding of their internationalist consciousness; it is harmful not just in its present form, which has been described above, but is also fraught with a serious danger for the future since it may, in a certain situation, (if it is ignored or kept outside the field of view of criticism) grow into real nationalism or chauvinism.

In the conditions of our society we describe as nationalism or chauvinism a clearly pronounced antisocialist attitude toward the nationalities question, attempts to cultivate ideas of the national superiority and national exclusiveness of one's own people, the setting of one's own people against others, actual appeals for national aloofness, self-isolation, or claims to a privileged position within the system of inter-nation relations, and a clearly hostile attitude to the international fraternity of the Soviet peoples. Both these forms of nationalism are diametrically opposed to socialist internationalism. Manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism emanate from individuals rather than nations or other socially organized groups.

We can describe as unquestionably nationalist, for instance, the actions of the main organizers and instigators of the December 1986 events in Alma-Ata, no matter what the motives were that prompted them to commit this crime. The same applies to the view expounded in the manuscript under review. An example of utterly overt chauvinism is provided by the verbal and printed statements of the "exponents" of the so-called "Pamyat" Society and similar associations.

The viewpoint that chauvinism is the only source of nationalism is untenable in both scientific and practical terms. These two forms of nationalism are indeed interconnected and independent. Any distortions or violations of the principle of social justice committed by the people of one nationality in respect of representatives of other nations evoke legitimate protests and dissatisfaction on the part of the latter. When these distortions and violations go on with impunity over a lengthy period of time, they are interpreted as deliberate disregard for the interests of others, and the reaction to them is likely to be injurious. Representatives of either a big or a small nation can be at the receiving end of injustice; in other words, cause and effect change in accordance with the prevailing circumstances. It is important when correcting a bias toward one side to avoid a bias toward the other. In our view attempts—observed here and there—to simplify the solution of complex and delicate problems concerning the nationalities policy by translating them into arithmetical terms can hardly serve as a guarantee against such mistakes. From all viewpoints, their consequences can turn out to be just as undesirable as those which we are trying to put right at the moment.

However, let us return to our author. A central place in his lengthy deliberations is assigned to the "idea" of reverting to the creation of autonomous administrative units with an integrated and, in national terms, homogenous population—an idea, he claims, formulated by Lenin. "Any infringement of the integrated and uniform composition of the population without any economic need or requirement for this," he writes, "is an infringement of the principle of the equality of nations and a manifestation of the great-power aspirations of a bureaucratic administrative apparatus." Adenov claims that even the December 1986 events in Alma-Ata were a direct consequence of a deviation from this principle, a result of the "policy of artificial regulation of the correlation of nations in union republics."

So it appears that we are looking in vain for the true culprits of the said events. According to his conviction, it is not individuals who are to blame for them but some kind of phenomenon of statewide magnitude whose workings are unpredictable and are by no means limited to what happened in Alma-Ata. "Such incidents may recur in other republics," Adenov prophesies, "where the influx of immigrants is just as high as in Kazakhstan." In order to forestall such incidents, he suggests, it is necessary to put an end to the migration of citizens from one republic to another, and make the population of each republic integrated and homogenous in terms of nationality, as Lenin allegedly deemed possible. Then follows a quotation from Lenin's work "Critical Notes on the Nationalities Issue." Here it is: "Undoubtedly... in order to eliminate all national oppression, it is extremely important to set up autonomous okrugs, even on the smallest scale, with an—in national terms—integrated, unified population.... All this is beyond question and can be disputed only from a hardened bureaucratic viewpoint" (Footnote 1) (Complete Collected Works, Vol 24, pp 148, 149). Lenin actually wrote this in 1913 during the heated polemic with representatives of the Bund [petit bourgeois nationalist organization representing mainly Jewish artisans living in western parts of Russia] on the subject of the Austrian Social Democrats' Brno National Program which proposed that Austria be divided into administrative units "along national lines, instead of the original historic lands." "It is beyond question," Lenin notes, "that no Marxist, nor even a radical democrat, would defend the original Austrian lands or Russian guberniyas [provinces] or uyezds [districts]..., that he would not dispute the need to replace these obsolete divisions with new divisions along national lines **where possible**" (my emphasis N.D.). This remark precedes the quotation to which Adenov refers. I am sure that readers will note that Lenin is saying that it would be preferable to replace the old administrative divisions in tsarist Russia and in Austria, that is, the Austrian lands and Russian guberniyas and uyezds, with divisions based on the national composition of the population—where possible, that is.

Immediately after the quotation cited by Adenov, Lenin has the following paragraph: "The national composition of the population, while being **one** of the key economic factors, is **neither the only nor the most important** of the factors. Cities, for instance, play a **key** economic role under capitalism, and in cities everywhere the national composition of the population is most mixed. To cut off cities from the villages and okrugs which gravitate toward them economically because of 'nationality' considerations would be absurd and impossible. Hence Marxists cannot espouse the 'national-territorialist' principle wholly and exclusively" (Footnote 2) (ibidem, p 149).

What can you say about such unscrupulous use of Lenin's ideas and the deliberate and crude distortion of their essence? It is an impermissible and immoral attempt on the part of the author to camouflage his own highly unsound national sentiments. Second, to regard something as sensible and possible that Lenin described as absurd and impossible 75 years ago, irrespective of the social system (the mixed character of the population is now characteristic not only of all contemporary cities but also of most villages and settlements), is as absurd as to demand that time be turned back and spring "replaced" by winter again.

In conditions of the development of socialism, where the economy of the Soviet national republics constitutes a

single economic complex, the migration of the population within the Union is an inevitable and natural phenomenon. Adenov's demands to stop this process by passing special laws prohibiting migration (he wrote about this in another paper of his), backed up by measures of an economic nature to ensure that moving to another republic would be disadvantageous in economic terms, are devoid of any real basis and represent an absurd and, what is more, antidemocratic dream. They are profoundly alien to the internationalist spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Yet this is the subject which the author teaches at a higher educational establishment.

People might say that Adenov's paper has not been published, that he has merely submitted it for examination, so why should it be necessary to criticize it in the press? The point is that interviews with the author have taken place. Yet he not only refuses to recognize that the views he expounds are erroneous, he also continues to cling stubbornly to them. Furthermore, he is relatively active, clearly seeking to enlist the support of the greatest possible number of like-minded people. He has photocopied one of his papers along these lines as a separate brochure which he has dispatched to many of the country's cities and republics.

This explains the need for the publication of this article.

Significance of CPSU Plenum Analyzed

PM231509 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 88 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Ideology of Renewal: More Socialism"—boldface passage as published]

[Text] Not even 2 years have passed since the days when the 27th congress summed up its fearless analysis and bold quest: The radical transformations in all spheres of our life are not simply slogans but a course which the party will pursue firmly and without deviation.

Some truly historic steps have been taken along this extremely short section of the path, which is equivalent to no more than the blink of an eye in history—society was energetically oriented toward the future by the innovative decisions of the Central Committee January and June plenums. The agenda modestly listed what seemed to be the topical issue: "On Progress in the Restructuring of Secondary and Higher Education and the Party's Tasks Regarding Its Implementation"—report by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. But the report itself, the entire course taken by the discussion, and especially the speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, reveal the plenum's key importance in today's conditions. It thoroughly upgrades the revolutionary arsenal of renewal of the revolutionary restructuring now underway in the country.

No, it did not overlook a single one of the specific problems of our education—from the supply of textbooks and computers to schools to the introduction of radical changes in the postulates of reform, from the position of teachers and professors to the elaboration of the concept of democratic management of public education. On the contrary, during the process of preparation for the plenum, and at the Central Committee session itself, these problems were studied with the keenest of interest and with due consideration for public opinion and competent assessments, were weighed, and to a certain extent, have already resulted in targeted decisions. On the whole, the renewed educational system ought to reflect all society's needs and potential. The decisive word in this regard will be spoken by specialists. But the resolution adopted by the plenum is the party's political recommendations to all proponents of the people's enlightenment.

It is valuable that the broad view of the man of the future taken from the threshold of the school reform made it possible to concentrate on the fundamental ideological aspects of restructuring. An analysis of specific evidence and emerging circumstances—the entire picture of social phenomena—convincingly shows that the decisive deepening of restructuring, which has affected the vital interests of tens of millions of people, has again brought topical urgency to questions that seemed to have been already answered.

Having previously welcomed restructuring as some sort of a sign or symbol of long-awaited changes, people who have come into contact with its realities wish to look restructuring in the face. What is the essence of the incipient changes? What are we aiming for? What do we mean by the new quality of society? An ambiguity of perception can be sensed in the centripetal currents in life which are very strong at present— this was also conveyed by the course of the broad discussion on shaping people's world outlook which developed at the plenum.

People's perception of restructuring is rendered more complex not only by their diversity of life style, human experience, education, and political thinking but also by the crucial nature of everything taking place. Some phenomena have been torpedoed by restructuring while others continue to sprout lush blooms of stagnation; unaccustomed forms of economic management and social life are being introduced; socialist pluralism of opinion is actually in evidence, heated discussions are developing....

And all this is perceived in so many different ways!

Especially since some people expected nothing but some cosmetic repair work, a repainting of the socialist facade; others had in mind a partial "tune-up" of the obsolete economic mechanism. Yet others were ready to dismantle the system altogether. Some people got carried away by radical phraseology; others are keen to engineer a

leap: full speed ahead to the kingdom of plenty.... How can you avoid passions coming to the boil here? How can you avoid mental confusion? How can you prevent the appearance of either mourners of socialism or deprecators of socialist values, who have borrowed their suggested alternative from the arsenal of bourgeois liberalism and nationalism?

A complex ideological situation, but one which has developed naturally. The party is boldly embarking on work to reveal and overcome it—and the February plenum is yet further graphic proof of this. The party is literally having to fight to pursue the line of restructuring both in the labor sphere and in the social and spiritual spheres. It draws strength and confidence from the lessons of Bolshevism.

In today's situation it is the party, creatively developing the Marxist-Leninist teaching of society—and this was proved by the principled decisions of the 27th congress, the new edition of the CPSU Program, the constructive steps taken by Central Committee plenums, and the principled documents adopted in the year of the 70th anniversary of October—it is the party that shoulders the responsibility for shaping society's socialist awareness.

Those who are puzzled by the oncoming changes, those who find it difficult to restore the suddenly broken "time link," are being helped by the party to study the logic of the struggle.

Let us begin with the essentials. For whose sake was the revolution accomplished? Wherein lies the essence of socialism? It lies in the establishment of the people's power, priority for the working class, and prosperity for the working man. The revolution, having put an end to the society of exploitation, opens the door to socialism which, ultimately, must put an end to man's alienation from actual power, from the means of production, from the results of his own labor, and from spiritual values. The revolution itself is just the first step in this direction; it only proclaims man's rights; it is up to socialism to produce the reality of full equality of rights. This is according to Marx; this is according to Lenin!

Socialist practice in past decades has brought us considerably closer to a society of social justice, but we have not succeeded in implementing to a sufficiently full extent Lenin's principles of the new social system. This has been due to both external circumstances and internal factors. The personality cult, the administrative edict system of management, the dogmatic and voluntarist distortions, the bureaucratism, the braking mechanism, the group egotism, the lack of initiative were surely serious handicaps.

Is not the result of this even a certain self-alienation from real power, from the results of labor, and from many humanitarian values? Surely, by abandoning this burdensome heritage, we are reviving the genuine Leninist idea of socialist society and socialist personality? Therefore, restructuring leads not to the abandonment but to the consolidation of socialist foundations, to the correction of pernicious deformities.

We are not retreating by even a single step from socialism, from Marxism-Leninism, from all that has been gained and created by the people—this was solemnly proclaimed at the plenum and accurately captured by all the antennae of the world mass news media: by some with the optimism of solidarity, and by others with the disappointment of miscalculation. The party's intention is firm: to restore abiding socialist values in everybody's eyes, to remove the rust of indifference and bureaucratism from them, to cleanse them of everything inhuman, and to release and reveal the creative force of the individual.

By backing restructuring with the ideology of renewal, the party is taking upon itself the great task of theoretically explaining the new stage of society's development by totally relying on the substantive manifestations of socialism and by profoundly interpreting the innovations brought about by restructuring. In order to ensure a consistent transition to the new qualitative state of society without any distortions, it is necessary to select and arm the people with everything that really serves socialism and conforms with the interests of its development, to move toward goals which are actually socialist, not "borrowed."

In this context, it is easy to understand why the distant and recent "blank" and "not so blank" pages of history have touched a vital nerve and generated topical interest. The history of socialism is contained within the span of a single human lifetime. It is, therefore, evident that people in their millions perceive it as a profoundly personal matter, as part of their own family tree.

Looking back over the history of the Land of the Soviets, they feel echoes, chords of their own lives—their own actions, pain, and hopes—and concentrate all this in their perception of the present. Any carelessness, haste, or subjectivism in making evaluations, any witting or unwitting distortion of the truth instantaneously causes people to feel insulted and outraged and even disorients their views. Every party committee and every editorial board—and ours is by no means an exception—receive confirmation of this literally every day. At the plenum itself, almost every other speaker touched on the sore spots which link our history and the world outlook of the new generations.

The plenum raised in practical terms the question of producing a truthful and complete history of our party and our people which, without any bias and without any hypertrophied over-emphasis of individual aspects, would vividly and honestly depict the victories and failures, the discoveries and mistakes, the bright and the tragic—everything relating to how people in their millions lived, labored, and fought for what they believed.

We will certainly obtain this kind of truth about Soviet life, not time-serving or preordained forgeries. All we need is to place time, talent, and responsibility in the service of shaping correct historical thinking among the people.

Restructuring is turning socialist society in the direction of its genuine values. The individual is the most precious of them. The entire passion of the plenum, the essence of the thoughts and concerns of almost every single one of the speakers—academy president or Komsomol leader, head of a republic government or quality inspector from an enterprise in the Urals, party official or leader of a strictly technical department, rector of the capital's university or army general—focused on the nature and character of the man of the future, the man of the 3d millennium.

How firm will his beliefs be, and how substantive will his knowledge be? Will his soul be fired by the spark of exploration and pioneering enthusiasm? Will his mind be sharpened by economic accountability and independence in actions and decisions? Will he be imbued with social responsibility for his collective, for himself, and for his country? Will he manage to make sensible and full use of the benefits of developing democracy and growing plenty? It was, after all, for the sake of all this—for the sake of genuine human happiness and the self-revelation of the individual, for the sake of a just and highly fitting human commonwealth—that Lenin's immortal revolution was accomplished, that the present revolutionary restructuring is being accomplished.

"More socialism," the party proclaims, and it points out how we can sort out values and principles, which ought to considered truly socialist today, and what is to be developed and how.

Restructuring, which is geared to the best possible manifestation of human virtues, offers maximum opportunities for the involvement of individual experience and talent in social transformations. People are now learning practical economics, and the door must be opened wider for their initiative and creative activeness; independence in judgments and actions must be encouraged without fear of distortion. Let us not forget that it was here, in the creative sphere, that corrosion by the rust of alienation was deepest. Our society has an exceptionally great need to restore the working person's genuine initiative. After all, as has been said, socialism is a society of people with initiative, and our system itself is the greatest initiative in history.

Man has now been given broad rights in the sphere of labor and distribution. He must take a firm grip of the levers of the new methods of economic management. He must not forget for even a moment that adherence to the old is still strong and that it must be expected that actual manifestations of radical reform will be attacked with the weapons of sabotage and imitation, of wage leveling and artificial restrictions on the principles of social justice. Indeed there are daily instances of all this, and much proof of it was adduced at the plenum. The party uses science and experience to prove that the harmonization of the interests of society, the collective, and the individual can be achieved only through introduction of the principles of economic accountability, self-capitalization, self-financing, and self-management.

The party perceives democratization as the decisive means for achieving the goals of restructuring. It could be said that democratization is the soul of Lenin's concept of socialism. It was here that deformities in the past inflicted tangible damage on society. Not having fully mastered many of Lenin's fruitful ideas and designs and not having experienced them in practice, we suffered grave losses and substantially retarded the development of our system's quintessentially socialist advantages.

M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the plenum painted a broad picture of far-reaching processes relating to the democratic restructuring of our society, functional changes in state and social institutions, and development of the entire political system. Substantive work must be done in time for the 19th party conference on fundamental questions of the reform of the political system, so that principled decisions can guarantee a qualitatively new level of socialist democracy for society.

The movement of society's spiritual life in conditions of restructuring and the shaping of moral priorities, national values, and relations between nations were subjected to thorough investigation and constructive interpretation. These most delicate aspects of our life were examined from the positions of socialist ideals and with due consideration for the real dialectics of class and universal factors in today's specific conditions.

The party perceives a need to cleanse and enrich the spiritual sphere and build up its moral strength and creative potential. It calls upon Communists working in this area to display invariable democratism, trust in and support for talent, tolerance toward the unusual, and benevolent encouragement of initiative and exploration.

Having experienced the suffering necessary to achieve restructuring, which is needed for the profound renewal of the society in which we live, the soul and brain of our party are also keenly aware of the need for new political thinking in the world around us. Now it is universally recognized that Lenin's heirs have accomplished a major breakthrough in the scientific cognition of contemporary global realities and have elaborated an innovative and fruitful policy. This humanitarian course is undergoing further dynamic development.

The plenum documents and the stipulations and conclusions contained in the speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and unanimously approved by the plenum are becoming a working instrument and an extremely powerful spiritual

charge for every party component, for every "superintendent" of restructuring. They radiate a powerful surge of Bolshevik thinking and revolutionary duty which substantively enriches us on the eve of the 19th party conference.

The clearer the avenues for action, the more persistently we tell ourselves: Restructuring means work, more work, and even more work.

Dissident Freed From Psychiatric Hospital

AU240945 Paris AFP in English 0920 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, Feb 24 (AFP)—Soviet dissident Lev Ubojko, who had been interned in a psychiatric hospital since December, was freed Wednesday, according to a member of a pacifist group.

Irina Krivova, who belongs to the group to promote confidence between East and West, said that 49-year-old Mr Ubojko had been released from the hospital at Chelyabinsk, in the Urals.

Mr Ubojko, a physicist, has spent a total of 17 years in detention camps and psychiatric hospitals. He was first sentenced for anti-Soviet activity in 1970. [passage omitted]

Lev Timofeyev, who heads the Press-Club Glasnost, indicated that a Moscow psychiatric hospital had refused to admit Mr Ubojko when he was sent there after his arrest in December.

Ukrainian Party Censures Donetsk University

AU171041 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 9 Feb 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has discussed the progress made in restructuring the work of the party committee and the rectorate of the Donetsk State University in line with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. It was noted that the university played a significant role in shaping cadre potential and in developing science in the Donbass. Its collective has improved cooperation in the training of specialists with production and scientific institutions.

At the same time, the university has failed to make a sharp turn in the training and education of students, and in scientific research at the university. The lack of a system in the cadre work performed by the party committee and the rectorate has brought about stagnation in the movement of cadres. Due to the lack of highly qualified personnel, many departments and faculties have failed to provide their graduates with a fundamental university education in a number of specialities.

Practically all measures taken to restructure teaching have been superficial. Contracts for training cadres for the interested ministries and departments do not envisage the participation of the branches in their training and a compensation for material expenses made by the higher educational institution. Progress is very slow in restructuring social sciences departments, whose impact on the ideo-moral shaping of the future specialists is quite insufficient, and which have been unable to become a support point for the other higher educational institutions in the region.

The pace of increasing the range and effectiveness of scientific research has been slow. Appropriate attention has not been paid to creative cooperation among scientists of various types, and to the early engagement of students in a creative quest.

The university's material-technological base has been neglected; the shortage of electronic computing equipment is particularly palpable. Social problems are not being adequately settled.

It has been emphasized that the revealed shortcomings were largely brought about by the adherence of the rectorate and the party committee to bureaucratic rule, to formal methods of management which hinder democratization, the invigoration of the human factor, the development of glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism.

In political educational work, too much attention continues to be paid to mass events, and too little account is being taken of real processes taking place in the milieu of students, to their needs and spirits. The role of students' self-management has been downgraded.

The Ukrainian Ministry of Higher and Secondary Special Education does not properly assist the university in working out and taking measures to restructure education, to reinforce its cadre potential, and to strengthen the material-technological base. Voroshilovskiy Gorkom, as well as Donetsk Gorkom and Obkom do not have adequate insight into the work of the university's party organization.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has found that the work performed by the party committee and the rectorate of the Donetsk State University did not meet the requirements of the 27th CPSU Congress and of the main guidelines for restructuring higher and secondary special education in the country, and has demanded that the causes of the stagnation phenomena at the university be thoroughly analyzed, and energetic measures be taken to overcome them. [passage omitted]

The university's party committee has been obligated to eliminate dogmatism and formalism from ideo-educational work, to cultivate among the future specialists dialectical thinking, high political culture, feelings of patriotism, and authentic internationalist views. In this connection, the attention of social sciences departments

is to be focused on intensifying the struggle against dogmatism in teaching Marxism-Leninism. The task has been set to boost the role of the Komsomol organization in working out new approaches to educational work and to make fuller use of the potentials of students' self-management, and of young people's creative activity. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian CP CC Sums Up Discussion

AU231748 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 16 Feb 88

[Unattributed report: "From the Height of Restructuring Tasks"]

[Text] As has been reported, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has summed up the results of the discussion in the republic's party organizations on elective organs' reports on the work in leading restructuring. A Central Committee plenum, obkom, gorkom, and raykom plenums, and meetings in 43,792 basic party organizations and 43,083 shop party organizations were held.

It was noted that this highly important political campaign gave new impulse to the Communists' and the working people's support for the party's restructuring policy. The campaign also helped promote initiative and activity on all party levels, overcome the obsolete methods of leadership, and establish a new moral and psychological atmosphere. In addition, it marked an important stage in preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, most party committee plenums, and meetings of Communists thoroughly analyzed the activity of elective organs in implementing the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the successive CPSU Central Committee plenums. The campaign has generalized the experience accumulated in democratizing public and internal party life, and in carrying out a radical economic reform; it has revealed the causes of shortcomings, defined concrete ways to follow, and determined what has to be done to deepen restructuring in all links and at all levels.

The reports and speeches were, as a rule, business-like, and adhered to principles in their appraisals and opinions. A step forward has been made in the level of criticism and self-criticism, particularly of criticism "from below" and of its constructiveness. Notwithstanding the sharp character of the discussion, the plenums and meetings were remarkable for an atmosphere of party comradery and for the awareness of common responsibility for the destinies of restructuring.

Preparations for the plenums and meetings were made on a democratic basis, using new methods; this contributed toward an open and frank atmosphere. Members of party committees and aktivists took an active part in the preparations. Obkom, gorkom, and raykom secretaries and bureau members visited labor collectives, met with Communists, and lent an ear to remarks and proposals. The theses of accountability reports were sent in advance to members of elective organs and were published in the local press. Sociological investigations and surveys by questionnaires were made, and "direct lines" of communication were established with party committees.

The press offered its pages to Communists and non-party people for their contributions to the column entitled "To the Plenum's Tribune." The republic-level mass media alone published and conveyed to the Central Committee plenum more than 200 long items. Public opinion was taken into account in drafting party documents.

The plenums and meetings reflected the progress made in restructuring, offered an opportunity to see who and to what extent was imbued with the awareness of the need for changes, and what effects this awareness had on practical activity and the concrete results. The discussion proved that restructuring in the republic was deepening and gathering strength. Positive changes are taking place in the style and methods of work performed by party, administrative, and economic organs. Glasnost and democratic principles are expanding in the selection and distribution of cadres. The practice of self-management is being firmly established in labor collectives. The management apparatus is shrinking, and its structure is improving. The switch to the new management conditions is stimulating the growth of effectiveness in the republic's economy.

At the same time, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee pointed out that the plenums and party meetings showed that the progress made in restructuring the economic, sociopolitical, and other spheres of the republic's life still has not fully meet the requirements of the 27th Congress and the succeeding CPSU Central Committee plenums. The party still has not succeeded in encompassing with its influence all processes of democratization, of economic reform, and of development in the social sphere.

This is why there has not been a proper breakthrough along the entire line of restructuring. In various sectors and places, the restructuring progress is complex and uneven. Having lost time at the initial stage of restructuring, some party organs still have not developed their activity property. As a result, they have in essence not achieved any real changes for the better. The Central Committee emphasized the great importance of the CPSU Central Committee decision on Kiev Gorkom's report on invigorating the efforts to accelerate restructuring and to eliminate shortcomings.

The participants in Zaporozhye, Kirovograd, Nikolayev, and Odessa Obkom plenums sharply assessed the state of affairs and omissions in the activity of the bureaus and party committee secretaries in leading restructuring. The work performed by the Dobropolskiy Gorkom first secretary in Donetsk Oblast, Krinichanskiy Raykom second

secretary in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, and a Koretskiy Raykom secretary in Rovno Oblast was found unsatisfactory (they were dismissed from their posts), and so was the work by the party committees and bureaus of 524 basic and shop party organizations. Also 4,055 secretaries were not reelected due to passiveness, and 18,200 bureau and party committee members were replaced. Disgraced functionaries were removed from party committees.

The Central Committee has called the attention of party committees and bureaus to the pressing need to hasten the adoption of the political methods of leadership, and to overcome the practice of running the business by means of orders and decrees and by pressure. It was noted that the aspiration of party committees to take everything upon themselves and to issue commands bogged them down in routine, prevented them from keeping abreast of developments, and allowed them to merely file these developments instead of making forecasts about the situation, instead of proposing and organizing specific moves. The Communists strongly object to the practice of rigidly regulating the activity of party organizations, including meeting agenda, because this practice restricts their independence and initiative.

In general opinion, the organization of and control over the execution of the adopted decisions still rank among the weakest spots in party work. This question was also sharply raised at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum. The activity of party committees, the speakers noted, could have been more effective if there had been fewer decisions and documents adopted, and if their implementation were better verified.

Shortcomings in cadre work were criticized everywhere. The point is that, in the period of democratization and of expanding glasnost, it is essential to give up the rigid questionnaire restrictions in the selection of leaders, and to ensure that really talented, thinking leaders, and not formal ones, are appointed everywhere. At the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, as well as at the Donetsk and Voroshilovgrad Obkom and Kiev Gorkom plenums, proposals were made to make obkoms more independent in this respect, as well as to eliminate superfluous regulations for cadre questions, and to give up the practice of submitting them to many superior organs for approval.

It was insistently emphasized that, to forestall violations of the Leninist principles for leadership, to prevent deviations from party ethics, moral norms, and the Soviet laws, it was highly important to ensure in deed collective decisionmaking and a comradely atmosphere in party committees, and to eliminate the authoritarian style. In this context, it was proposed to introduce the practice of examining accountability reports delivered by party committee first secretaries every year at bureau sessions.

It was noted that the efforts to raise the role and activity of elective organs and their members, and to eliminate the attempts made by the apparatus to command them, still have not succeeded everywhere. The speakers noted that some party committee secretaries took too little care of elective aktivists, of their prestige and training, and did not engage them in preparing the agendas for bureau sessions and plenums. In this connection, many Communists spoke about the need to work out the status of a member of an elective party organ.

In a number of places, attention was called to the lingering and frequent practice to select candidates for party committee membership in camera, without any prior discussion on the subject in basic party organizations or labor collectives. In his speech at the meeting, V. I. Dovzhenko, party committee secretary at the "Druzhba" kolkhoz in Tokmakovskiy Rayon, Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, proposed to restrict the term of duty to 2 years in an elective party organ, including that of party committee secretaries at all levels. The same proposals were also made in other oblasts.

The accountability reports showed that progress in restructuring at the low party level was particularly difficult. It was found necessary to examine ways to improve gorkoms and raykoms work in leading restructuring in basic party organizations at a plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The participants in the discussion expressed the view that many bureaus and party committees still have not managed to find effective means, forms, and methods to invigorate the human factor. Obsolete stereotypes and dogmatic approaches are being eliminated too slowly in propaganda and mass political work. Many speeches reflected apprehensions over the erosion in the ideological foundations of some people, particularly in the youth milieu. Concern was expressed about the way some parts of mass media are more frequently reporting facts in a distorted, biased, and sensational way, without any distinct political emphasis. Even clear misinformation contained in some controversial materials is frequently being left without any commentary or a well-substantiated answer.

A thorough analysis was made of efforts by bureau and party committee members and secretaries to intensify the party's impact on accelerating socioeconomic development, to radically reform the economy, and to ensure that the performance of enterprises and associations under conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing is stable.

The organs of the State Agricultural Committee were sharply criticized both at the plenum of the Ukrainian Central Committee and in the field discussions on accountability reports. It was noted that for the time being, this department has failed to ensure a breakthrough in agricultural production. In the activity of its apparatus, there is a great deal of bureaucratism and

irresponsibility. Highly important issues concerning social development in the countryside are not being properly settled everywhere, which is why the demographic situation has deteriorated in a number of localities.

Shortcomings were also incurred in holding the plenums and meetings. Some of them were held in an atmosphere of outdated stereotypes and were dull and orchestrated. Many plenums were inadequate in revealing the style and methods of work performed by elective organs, and the latter's role and place in restructuring. In some accountability reports, the results of economic activity were artificially associated with the work performed by the bureau and secretaries. The edge of criticism was occasionally aimed "down," against secretaries of party organizations and economic leaders, while doses served to bureau members and secretaries were moderated. The decisions were sometimes superficial, unspecified. Kiev, Ternopol, and Kharkov Obkoms suspended a number of party meetings because they were poorly prepared for.

It was noted that, notwithstanding the shortcomings that occurred, the party committee plenums and meetings held to examine accountability reports by elective organs, on the whole, justified themselves. No doubt, they will exert a lasting influence on the entire successive work, on the course of restructuring. What matters is, as the Communists emphasized, to translate this militant, constructive mood everywhere into specific deeds, and to keep it alive.

As reported before, the Central Committee Politburo has examined the critical remarks made at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, at the obkom, gorkom, and raykom plenums, and at the party meetings, and worked out a concrete plan for complying with them.

During the discussion on accountability reports, concrete proposals were made on preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. They have been generalized and sent to the CPSU Central Committee.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and obkoms have sent into the field groups of party functionaries to give practically assistance to gorkoms, raykoms, basic party organizations, and elective organs against whom there were serious grievances. Particular control has been established over organizations run by party committees and bureaus whose work was found unsatisfactory.

'Lessons in Democracy' To Be Learned in Ukraine

PM171129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 88 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Article by special correspondents V. Yegorov and M. Odinets under the rubric "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "New Lessons in Democracy"]

[Text] Ukrainian SSR—"Against?.... Just two.... So the vote is unanimously in favor?"

The enormous hall in the "Ukraina" Palace of Congresses, which was filled to overflowing, resounded with peals of laughter. No, we were not at an evening of satire and humor. We were attending a general meeting of Kiev University Communists who were discussing the report by their party committee on work to lead the restructuring process.

"Well, so the chairman made a slip," grumbles a reader used to communicating with the masses solely through the presidium, "so what of it? Is it really worth publicizing such an insignificant event?"

The incident is indeed rather trivial. But it seems to us that this curious episode quite clearly highlights the dialectics of restructuring, so to speak: Its revolutionary nature still fairly often comes into conflict with the form remaining from the old days and with those attributes, albeit external, which nevertheless possess a very insidious quality—they are not immune to becoming the substance of the matter or, to be more precise, giving a good imitation of it. When this happens, people realize with annoyance and distress that they have been dealing with an imitation of democracy rather than democracy itself, that instead of glasnost they have been invited to play at glasnost, and that instead of new thinking they have new phraseology.

Professor Ivan Aleksandrovich Slepov, party veteran and management specialist, became excited like a young man. "It would be a dangerous illusion to assume that restructuring will go through without a hitch. Generally speaking, if we are honest, wishful thinking is virtually in our blood. Even now, when we have only just begun to sweep out the trash and the debris from the building and tear down the rotten walls to let in more light and air, ebullient reports are being given all over the place: 'Hurray! We have restructured by 100.2 percent. Now we are waiting for further instructions.' But if you look closely, you see that only the cobwebs have been dusted from the corners! What kind of restructuring do you call this? You know, I have seen many reforms and innovations in my lifetime which, forgive me, have come to nothing. I believe that the current renewal process is for real, but looking at it as an economist and a sociologist I keep remembering the warning given by M.S. Gorbachev: 'It is very important that we do not "talk restructuring to death," that we do not spend all our time talking about it.' True, this was said about 2 years ago, but in my opinion it is still relevant today."

Indeed, attending party meetings and party committee plenary sessions and reading reports about them in the local press, we encounter recurrences of rhetoric and logorrhea time and again. For example, participants in the Kirovograd Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom plenum at the end of last year were given assurances from the rostrum more than once that restructuring in

the oblast is in the ascendant and having a healthy effect in all spheres. Unfortunately, these assurances did not amount to much more than routine phrases and tributes to fashion.

We learned from the report by N. Samilyk, first secretary of the obkom, that industrial enterprises are still making a bad job of honoring their contractual pledges, that the two-shift and three-shift work system is only being introduced on a formal basis, that the situation in transport and capital construction is far worse, that, although fixed capital in rural areas has increased by 11 percent in the last 2 years, gross agricultural output has hardly increased at all, and that the sugar beet harvest has dropped from 276 quintals in 1970 to 183 quintals in 1987.... There were lots more facts and figures registering a "reduction," "deterioration," and "retreat from former positions." But the refrain remained: "Restructuring... Restructuring... Restructuring...." One involuntarily recalled a piece of ancient oriental wisdom: "However often you say 'halva' it will not make anything sweeter."

The discrepancy between word and deed is possibly the strongest factor in undermining people's faith in wholesome change. They are understanding toward an honest, brave admission of mistakes but rightly believe that the time has come to stop blaming the sins of yesterday for current difficulties.

In a conversation with us Nikolay Vladimirovich Kalyuzhnyy, a team leader of troubleshooters for automatic lathes at the Kiev "Mayak" Plant, expressed himself in clear, workmanlike terms:

"Restructuring, as many members of our team understand it—correctly, I believe—is not some theoretical abstract like 'developed socialism' but a real, living cause which must produce concrete results. In other words, there must be enough meat and sausage on sale in the stores, the queue for apartments must move more quickly, and city transport must work more efficiently. Bureaucrats and bunglers must be removed from office without waiting for their health to deteriorate as they become older. Our party's Central Committee has given a very precise formula to ensure that restructuring is implemented with greater vigor and produces tangible results: More democracy, more socialism!"

As in the rest of the country, the Ukraine is also undergoing a process of democratization. We could give tens, hundreds of examples illustrating its healthy, bracing influence on production matters, the social sphere, culture, and, particularly interesting, the work of party organs—but we will limit ourselves to just one. At the most recent Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, more businesslike, principled observations were addressed to the Central Committee Politburo and Central Committee secretaries than have been, perhaps, in the last 20 years. Whereas previously people only "criticized" leaders of the republic in whispers in the corridor, "without having to look them in the eye," now the people criticizing these leaders do so face to face, which, you must agree, is an encouraging sign. Even the keynote speaker—quite unheard of!—was reproached for allowing some areas of his report to reflect outmoded attitudes and—we would add—the old trend of delivering a set speech rather than giving a real account.

Incidentally, genuine democratization of internal party life, we heard on more than one occasion during the discussions, depends to a large or, as some insisted, to a decisive extent on the first secretary of the party committee. Let us look the truth in the face: The party has always been rich and glorious by virtue of the cadres who are truly committed to the great cause they serve, but in the era of the personality cult, the "glorious decade" of voluntarism, and the long period of "stagnation" in addition to these cadres—honest, principled, and personally modest—an evil generation of party bureaucrats and appanage princes became firmly established and gained strength on a rayon, oblast, and republic scale. They needed no encouragement to throw their weight about to make their subordinates tremble. They themselves, in an effort to keep their heads above water and, should the opportunity arise, climb the next step on the nomenklatura ladder, fawned and ingratiated themselves before their superiors, sang their praises, each trying to drown out the other, and even confirmed their loyalty with expensive gifts shamefully described as "souvenirs."

Still fresh in the republic's memory are sad recollections of the "reign" of former first secretaries of a number of Ukrainian Communist Party obkoms who, either supplanting or crushing elected party and soviet organs and economic leaders and acting on the principle "I will get what I want," flagrantly violated the principles of democratic centralism and the norms of party ethics. Sometimes there was no proper check on these local "leaders" and their actions went unmonitored. But this kind of monitoring is so necessary.

The political bankruptcy of these people is a logical inevitability. The fresh wind of restructuring has blown many zealous administrators from their comfortable chairs; administrators who had tried—and not without success!—to prove that a perfectly respectable cult can be built from the most worthless personality. But where is the guarantee that episodes like these will not be repeated?

"For goodness sake!" our "reader in high places" may skeptically smirk at this point. "What exactly are we talking about? The statute clearly states: A party member has the right to 'criticize any party organ and any Communist, irrespective of his position, at any party meeting, conference, congress, or party committee plenum.' What greater guarantee do you need?"

This is indeed so, but over the years, unfortunately, all of us have had occasion to see for ourselves that there is sometimes a considerable distance between a proclaimed right and the exercise of that right. This discrepancy, when the slogans say one thing and life shows something completely different, is given "theoretical" substantiation: People lie to save their skins, they say, and people are nothing more than "cogs" accustomed to passivity and the soothing self-justification that criticizing the authorities is counterproductive.

Times have changed but timidity has remained. This is because human nature is not like working clothes: When the old ones wear out you go out and buy some more. As for new thinking, well, it is proving very difficult to establish. After all, it is not our uncle's way of thinking that we have to restructure but our own—we have to cleanse our minds of the scabs left by ossified dogmas and accustomed stereotyped images. We have to disturb our own material prosperity and renounce our privileges which, as it happens, through the will of the party are gradually fading and will probably eventually disappear completely. Finally, we have to disturb the peace of mind guaranteed us by the position of those around us for whom "everything is someone else's business"—only by making this sacrifice can we become real fighters.

Another "brake," our interlocutors prompted, is that, as a result of certain objective and subjective factors, the traditions of democracy have been lost in our country, and its ethos, if you like, has not been developed. The party honestly tells Communists and all the people that they have to learn democracy. We will underline this word: Learn. Not "improve" or "develop" but learn, which more often than not means beginning at the beginning and understanding that the fundamentals of democracy must be very thoroughly explained and made the norm so that regression is impossible....

But let us go back to the problem of criticism "without respect of persons" which, you must agree, is also a sign of democracy. At the moment the example in this respect is being set by the first secretaries who draw the fire onto themselves, so to speak. At the abovementioned Kirovograd party obkom plenum in particular N. Samilyk complained that the obkom secretaries, himself included, are not criticized enough. Well, the reaction was immediate. One of the speakers literally said the following: "In my opinion, by virtue of his work experience, energy, and industriousness, Nikolay Ignatyevich would be capable of running another oblast as well, perhaps more. (For your information: In virtually every indicator Kirovograd Oblast brings up the rear in the republic reports—V.Ye., M.O.) At the same time I would like to say this. You, Nikolay Ignatyevich, should strictly control yourself when making speeches. At times you become carried away and speak for too long. The effect is lost."

Oh, how bold and principled! Particularly if you consider that the obkom first secretary had already referred to this shortcoming in self-criticism in his report.

Yes, when it comes to the "top man" or other people in direct authority over us, any outburst of criticism still very often smacks of panegyrics. We have studied the documents of several party obkom and raykom plenums on the question of leadership of the restructuring process and have always found criticism addressed to the first secretaries, but possibly the most serious observations have been that they are not exacting enough. Not with regard to themselves, incidentally, but toward others. They apparently heap everything onto their own powerful shoulders and spare the rest of us. There does seem to be some criticism but it is moderated. Judge for yourselves. This is how the first secretary of the Volodarsko-Volynskiy Raykom "criticized" the first secretary of the Zhitomir party obkom: "Shortcomings in the work of the party obkom bureau stem from the fact that, as first secretary, V. Kavun makes a valiant effort to take more upon himself, get things moving, and make changes in all areas. He is largely successful. But by doing this he diminishes the responsibility of others to a certain extent...."

When you hear speeches like this, suspicion involuntarily creeps in: Are we not dealing in this instance with criticism which has been doled out, so to speak, and sanctioned by the object of the criticism? Now criticism is aimed at everyone and everything and we feel uncomfortable if we do not join in ourselves in case people will think that we are still stagnating. Quite amazing is the ability of some administrators in ideology to "respond" instantly to changes in social life while any real cause engendered by the masses' creativity is immediately formalized, soon made into a compulsory, bureaucratic ritual, and thereby buried.

However, how can we prevent the appearance of cults and cult followers and rule out the possibility of arbitrary government and the abuse of the great power concentrated in the hands of first secretary of a party committee, from rayon level upward? It seems that this problem will not be overlooked by the participants in the All-union Party Conference. We feel that the following proposals which came up during our conversations with party activists and members of party committees merit attention:

1. Party committee first secretaries of all ranks should be elected from among several candidates.

Summing up various opinions, the rationale behind this proposal is as follows. From a dialectical standpoint the normal, correct development of a social organism is only possible when two or more forces are at work. We have only one party. Does this mean that the formation of factions and groups and a struggle between them is necessary for its normal development? This course was condemned by V.I. Lenin himself, and rightly so. So what other alternatives are left? We are left with a wrestling of opinions, discussions, the search for alternatives and variations, and the choice of the best of them. A contest between party comrades standing on the

same platform and advocating the same ideas of restructuring, socialism, and democracy. The rivalry which has always existed behind the scenes must come out into the open. That is all. There is nothing to be afraid of. A worthy rival is a good spur in work and a reliable means of control.

2. The first secretaries of party committees (first at rayon level and then higher) must be elected by secret ballot by all Communists in the party organization concerned.

From a technical standpoint, organizing these elections will possibly be more complex than provided for by the present procedure, but, on the other hand, the likelihood of error when establishing a real party leader will be greatly reduced.

Incidentally, we heard this latter proposal in the corridors of the meeting of university Communists, the very same one where the usual unanimity was found to be lacking. It is a pity that we did not hear it on the rostrum. We are encouraged, nevertheless, that the strong shoots of lively ideas are forcing a way through the weeds of excessive organization, bureaucracy, and formalism.

Patriarch Addresses UNESCO Soiree

PM171743 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Feb 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ceremonial Soiree at UNESCO: The 1000th Anniversary of the Adoption of Christianity in Russia"]

[Text] Paris, 13 Feb—A ceremonial soiree marking the 1000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Russia has been held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris. In accordance with a decision adopted by this representative international organization's 24th General Conference session, this year is being marked as the Russian Orthodox Church's jubilee. The jubilee ceremony held in the French capital was attended by a representative delegation headed by Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk. Before the celebrations began Metropolitan Vladimir observed, in an interview to a TASS correspondent, that the Russian Orthodox Church is entering the second millenium of its history with the hope of establishing peace on earth. The Soviet Government's peace initiatives, he stressed, are advancing this cherished goal. Mankind's moral cleansing, which coincides with the processes of renewal now taking place in society, will remain one of our church's most important tasks in the next millenium.

Metropolitan Vladimir addressed those present at the soiree. The adoption of Christianity in Russia, he said, had a profound impact on world history. Ten centuries ago ancient Russia entered the ranks of the world's enlightened states, took up an equal place, and acquired great international standing. The church is now required to participate in developing and improving our society. The last 70 years in our church's history has been the first experience of a church existing in the new social conditions, Metropolitan Vladimir observed. It has been an experience of world-historical significance.

The Russian Orthodox Church has been in constant contact with other religions in the country and has developed and continues to develop fraternal relations with churches abroad. Our church, he said, is playing an important role in the modern ecumenical and irenic movement.

Participants in the ceremonial soiree were read a telegram of congratulations from Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All the Russias.

Official Describes Efforts Against Drug Use

LD161645 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 16 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov reports:

Criminal proceedings on charges of drug-related crimes were instituted against 80,000 persons in the Soviet Union over the past two years. This was reported at a news conference today by chief of the Main Directorate of the Criminal Investigation Department of the USSR Ministry of the Interior, Lieutenant-General of the Militia Vyacheslav Pankin.

Over this period, the number of minors against whom criminal proceedings were instituted decreased by 26 per cent. The number of teenage drug addicts decreased, too, 15,000 persons stopped using narcotics in 1987 as a result of the widening of a network of special medical institutions and improvement of methods of treatment, 77 per cent of drug users underwent voluntary treatment.

Nevertheless, the questions of drug addiction remain topical in the USSR, Vyacheslav Pankin said; 131,000 drug users have been registered as of today.

Bodies of the USSR Ministry of the Interior vigorously participate in combating this evil. The USSR Ministry of the Interior and the Agro-Industrial Committee of the USSR ensured that the crops of plants that are sources of narcotics have been reduced and that the areas planted to such crops are guarded better. The decision has been adopted to discontinue state-sponsored planting of oil-bearing poppy.

The spokesman for the USSR Ministry of the Interior said that the Operation "Poppy" was held last year in the areas where poppy planting is widespread. Some 4,000 illegal plantations of opium poppy and hemp were destroyed during that operation.

"Not one country can effectively combat this problem single-handed," Lieutenant-General Pankin holds. "Therefore we can gain from Britain's or France's experience in combating drug addiction. Soviet specialists

have already visited those countries. The problem of treatment is no less important, and the experience of our foreign colleagues can come in handy in this area, too."

Statistics Chief Interviewed on Census

PM181555 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 1

[O. Osipov interview with M.A. Korolev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "A Portrait of the Country. Less Than a Year To Go to the All-Union Population Census"—first paragraph IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] As reported in the press earlier, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has backed the practical measures outlined by the government for the preparation of the All-Union Population Census in January 1989 which will make it possible to obtain the data necessary for the implementation of the country's social and economic development. M.A. Korolev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics [Goskomstat], gives details about this important action.

[Osipov] Mikhail Antonovich, many of our readers would probably like to know why precisely 12 January 1989 has been chosen?

[Korolev] As a rule, we hold a census once every 10 years, as near as possible to a year ending in 0, in accordance with the recommendations of the UN Commission for Statistics and the CEMA member countries' Commission for Cooperation in Statistics. The reason why the choice fell on 1989 rather than, say, 1990 is based on the need to make use of the census results during the drafting of the next 5-year plan.

The actual date of the census is chosen at a time when the population is least likely to be on the move: winter, middle of the week, school vacations over, and student vacations not yet started. Furthermore, even the hour has been chosen for taking a snapshot of the country, as it were—midnight on the night of 11-12 January.

This does not mean, of course, that the teller will be ringing your doorbell at midnight. He will come during one of the eight days set aside for the census.

[Osipov] Will the changes in our society's life be reflected in the upcoming census?

[Korolev] Unquestionably. For the first time in the history of our censuses, in addition to obtaining the traditional, purely demographic data, a whole range of questions relating to the population's housing conditions has been introduced. It is obvious how important this is for the implementation of the program put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress, which proposes to provide every family with its own apartment or house by the year 2000. Housing maintenance offices and house management agents will help us to make an objective assessment of housing conditions. They will supply information about the "age" of homes and the materials they are built from.

A number of new questions on the census questionnaire concern the development of vocational-technical education, studies of the migration and the birth rate, and cooperative and individual labor activity.

I would like to mention that the inhabitants of one in four apartments will take part in an additional selective poll.

[Osipov] Maybe my fears are unfounded, but take for instance such a complex question as the housing question: Can you count on people's complete objectivity? Some might try to suppress "additional" space out of fear that it might be taken away from them?

[Korolev] In general, the census is based on total confidence. After all, all information is taken on trust, and there are no documents to be submitted. This applies not only to questions on housing conditions but to all questions on the census questionnaire, whether they relate to nationality, age, education, or marital status. We are trusting in the citizens' great conscientiousness and sincerity. Furthermore, the teller has no right to use the information obtained for any other than statistical purposes and is not allowed to pass it on to anybody. The information itself is impersonal. Surnames are necessary only at the first stage in order to ensure that no one is omitted or polled twice. Names are not fed into the computer.

[Osipov] A last question: Who will help the professional statisticians during the census?

[Korolev] There will be around 1 million tellers and instructor-controllers. Local soviets will help us to select them from among institution personnel, teachers, students, and workers from enterprises. Of course, the success of the census will largely depend on these people. So we will be paying special attention to training them.

'Top Priority' Program on Informal Groups

LD131728 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 13 Feb 88

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner, with Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen? This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority". With me on the panel today as usual, Professor Radomir Bogdanov and professor Sergey Plekhanov.

Usually we discuss international affairs, which I think is quite appropriate, but today I suggest we look at some of the developments that have occurred in the Soviet Union over the past period that we call perestroyka; internal affairs, and in particular the emergence of so-called nonformal or informal groups, some of which seem to be attractive and others do not, and one that has received an awful lot of attention both in our own media...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] It's a matter of taste.

[Pozner] Well, I don't think so. That's one case where I don't quite agree with you. A lot has been said about one of these groups both in the Soviet media and abroad and that is the group that calls itself Pamyat, which in English means memory. Perhaps for the benefit of our listeners we should very briefly say that this group was born basically as a reaction to the lack of attention being paid to the preservation of historical monuments and culture in Russia proper and that's a legitimate cause. However, other developments took over in that particular organization. So, what are these informal organizations? How should they be seen in the context of democratization, glasnost, perestroyka? Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Well, I have no difficulties with all that. I believe if you have democratization you have all the doors open, you have all the flowers blooming and we should not be scared of something like that. But—there is one but—some informal organizations—by the way, I believe it's a natural reaction to the past practices—some organizations, they emerge with one purpose. Then all of a sudden, after some time, it turns out that they have some other purpose. For instance, Memory, Pamyat. It's a very noble cause. Memory of what, memory about what? Memory about the history of your own state, preservation of cultural heritage of your state, preservation of monuments, and so on and so on. [passage omitted]

It's one thing if you care about the historical past but another thing if you try to use that as a pretext, to do it in your own interests which are not always (?consistent) with the interests of the public opinion. And look at that Memory: You have a big organization—I don't know how many thousands of people you have in that but in any case they have branches all over the Soviet Union in some major cities—and what strikes me, there's a very clear-cut difference between the rank and file and people on the top. They are very different, with very different aims and designs. What worries me is that when this very, very top of this organization is trying to use your history and sometimes uninformed public opinion to (?append) their own business, to try to revive the most obscure feelings of the people, like anti-Semitism....

[Pozner, interrupting] Dr Plekhanov?

[Bogdanov continues] (?Just to) try to find out in the history, or to find out such explanations of your history which are very, very, very close to the conspiracy theory, something like that. That's worrying.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov, a friend of mine in the United States, when we discussed democracy, said to me: But Vladimir, you know, democracy is messy. Democracy is messy, it has its negative aspects. Do you think that applies in this particular case, that something like Pamyat, the leadership of Pamyat, its anti-Semitic inclinations, shall we say, and propaganda is part of democratization and it's messy but it's necessary, in the sense that you cannot avoid it?

[Plekhanov] Well, democracy is always messy but on the other hand I'm reminded of a beautiful definition of democracy, a beautiful comparison, by an English political theorist of the early 19th century. He compared monarchy to a big sailing ship, say a frigate, which is very convenient to sail—passengers have good lodgings there, you almost don't feel like you are at sea—but the ship hits a rock and then it's a real mess. You can ground, you can disappear in the ocean depths. Democracy, he said, is like a raft—it's very difficult to sink a raft but then your feet are always in the water. [laughter]

So I think that yes, we have to tolerate a lot of differences of opinion and a lot of various groups. We are now seeing the emergence of a political spectrum in the Soviet Union which is quite a natural and welcome development, because people are speaking out and they have different views. Let everybody be heard, so that people will be able to choose and to determine their own views about the country's political development. However, I'm worried by groups like Pamyat. I don't think that they have a lot of members. I've heard that according to the estimate by some of the leaders of Pamyat, even they think that they have a few thousand people across the Soviet Union, and leaders like that tend to overestimate, so I don't think that they have. They have sympathizers, people who are attracted to the idea that we must preserve and rebuild historical monuments. But the core, the political activists for whom it is a political movement rather than simply a landmark preservation movement, they don't number many people. But the thing that worries me about this movement is that there are certain rules in the democracy which everybody should observe, and No 1 is tolerance of the other's views. Now, rallies organized by Pamyat have been marked by a harsh level of intolerance...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Even violence.

[Plekhanov] Even violence, when people would be dragged off the stage and beaten up. You can't argue with those people. Their big argument is the fist. And that, of course, reminds a lot of people of Nazism and fascism, and this is a kind of political behavior which should not be tolerated in any civilized society.

Another thing is appeal to ethnic differences, animosities and frictions, like when a political leader consciously engenders anti-Semitism, using the most vile, historically discredited stereotypes that one can imagine. I don't think that this can be tolerated. I think that there are laws against that.

[Pozner] You know, if you look back in history you will find that whenever a country was approaching or was indeed in a process of change there was an effort by one or many groups to center—how should I put this?—to emphasize attention on someone or something who could be blamed for whatever was wrong in the past. [passage omitted]

What we see here in the case of Pamyat is something that has happened many, many times before in many other countries. It is not new. My question is this: The Soviet Constitution clearly, unequivocally bans the propagation of hatred—race hatred, religious hatred, ethnic hatred, and so on. It is a crime, according to the constitution, to do this. Pamyat, its leadership, does precisely that. Would you be for using the constitution, for arresting these people, prosecuting them, taking them to court, or do you think that in this period of glasnost, of openness, of discussion, it would be better perhaps to engage them in public discussion, be it on television or in the press, to show the population what they actually stand for instead of going through the courts? What is your view?

[Bogdanov] I have the same question to my friend Sergey when he says it should not be tolerated. My question is: What do you mean by that? [passage omitted] What worries me: In principle, I am in agreement with you but I object to intolerance, because...[Bogdanov changes thought] Or, you please define your position. What do you mean by that?

[Plekhanov] Yeah, I would like to define my position. I'm not talking about the whole might of the state being used to crush this group. What I'm talking about is when there are cases of violence during political rallies, or violence for the purpose...

[Pozner, interrupting] Or vandalism.

[Plekhanov]...of intimidating or vandalism—there have been some very filthy cases of intimidation by Pamyat members, then I think these are clear violations of the criminal law. Regardless of the political content of that, these are simply criminal cases which I think should be the attention of the...I mean they should be brought to court. And I think that the legal system should deal with them.

[Pozner] How do you in general view this emergence of different groups that call themselves informal or non-formal groups, especially young people? What is your reaction to them? Why do you think they have appeared in such numbers and what do you think the future bodes for these groups?

[Bogdanov] It's a natural reaction to what we had many, many years ago when everything was forbidden. It's a natural reaction. Now you have democratization and you have a need for self-expression. By the way, I may have a need for self-expression...

[Pozner, interrupting] Well, you're doing it right now, are you not?

[Bogdanov] I'm doing it right now. Now, just imagine for a while a couple of youngsters playing banjo, playing guitar, or singing—I don't know what. They need a kind of social context among themselves. That was also forbidden, that was also some kind of suspicious activity. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] Well, I'm talking not only about music here at this point.

[Bogdanov] Music, as to the politics, as to the politics. You know, if you have a bunch of people, bunch of youngsters fighting against the municipal authorities which are trying to destroy something like an historic hotel in Leningrad, I believe it's a very positive move and we should support the move.

[Pozner] Do you think that some of these youth organizations perhaps are a reflection of the fact that during the years, the Brezhnev period in particular, the Komsomol, the Young Communist League, compromised itself in the eyes of young people, not really doing anything to help young people, not really actively supporting the development of the younger generation and that therefore, when this new period began, many, many young people decided to organize their own groups, came together in their own associations, as a kind of challenge, if you wish, even to the official Komsomol? Do you think there is some sense in what I say there?

[Plekhanov] Yeah, there is some sense and to an extent this is a reflection of the passivity and bureaucratization of the Young Communist League. But I think that no matter how well the Komsomol works there will and should be informal groups, as many as possible. We must have a pluralistic political system which, because there are so many various viewpoints, so many interests which should be advanced in the public activity arena, that it's natural that various groups of citizens should spring. We are building a system which will be based on self-government, on self-management, at all levels of society. People should get involved in the affairs of the society. They have not been involved up to now. That's been abnormal. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] In other words, you would not say that the majority of those groups are in any way similar in their ideology to Pamyat...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] No.

[Pozner] And that type of organization?

[Plekhanov] Not at all. Even among the cultural heritage groups, like the group in Leningrad which is called Salvation—meaning not the religious salvation but salvation of the monuments—it does not want to have anything to do with Pamyat. Pamyat tried to infiltrate that group and they said: We don't want any racism; we are not like that; all we are interested in is cultural heritage. So even within that sector Pamyat is just a tiny fringe group. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] In other words, Dr Plekhanov, you said about the way we're moving towards true self-government, such informal organizations in a way could be small models of how that might work? You have 10 seconds to answer me.

[Plekhanov] I would say grass roots. They are grass roots of new Soviet democracy.

[Bogdanov] After all, what is the deal of communism, what is the ideal of socialism? Self-government.

[Pozner] That's right. And we'll talk more about that next time. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA To Publish Eight-Page Friday Edition

PM171649 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 88 First Edition p 1

["To Our Readers"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Every Friday from now on PRAVDA will have eight pages. There will continue to be an eight-page issue on Mondays as well.

Last year, in one of its "big" issues, the editorial collegium asked readers to say what kind of issue they wanted to see on Mondays.

Your advice helped us to revise a great deal and was useful to the editorial office.

Now we are putting the question to you again, dear readers: "What kind of issue do you want on Fridays?"

The point is that it is the end-of-the-week issue. Should we be taking this into account?

A "big" issue means that the paper can cover a wider range of topics. What topics, in your view, would it be best to include on a Friday? Who would you like to "meet with" in the paper on that day?

The present issue contains a number of new sections. Do you like them? Perhaps you could express an opinion.

We look forward to your letters. Mark the enevelope: "Friday PRAVDA."

Trotskiy's Pivotal Role in Red Army Denied

PM231431 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 88 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor Yu.I. Korablev, deputy chairman of the USSR Academy of Science Problem-Centered Scientific Council on the History of the Great October Socialist Revolution and leading scientific associate of the History of the USSR Institute, by correspondent V. Ivanov, under the rubric "Correspondence on Historical Topics": "Defense of the Revolution. On the 70th Anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction; boldface as published]

[Excerpts] We are approaching yet another memorable date in our state's life—the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces. Nowadays the editorial office mailbag contains numerous letters from people asking for details on the history of military building. What helped the newborn worker-peasant state to contain the pressure from internal and external enemies? How did it manage to create a mass regular army to defend the revolution in an exceptionally short time? What determined the success of its actions on the numerous fronts?

Our correspondent V. Ivanov asked Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor Yu.I. Korablev, deputy chairman of the USSR Academy of Science Problem-Centered Scientific Council on the History of the Great October Socialist Revolution and leading scientific associate of the History of the USSR Institute, to answer these and other questions from our readers.[passage omitted]

What Sort of Fabrications? [subhead]

[Ivanov] Recently, and especially on the occasion of the Soviet Armed Forces' jubilee, the Western press has again been publishing stories about L.D. Trotskiy as founder of the Red Army and organizer of all its victories during the civil war and the repulsion of the intervention. What was Trotskiy's real role in military building?

[Korablev] This question in itself is nothing new, and the fact that it has been raised now is nothing but a wish to revive the legends—compiled in the past by Trotskiyites and not without the active participation of Trotskiy himself—about the allegedly special and exceptional role he played in creating the Red Army and its victories. One could refer, in particular, to Isaac Deutscher's three-volume biography of Trotskiy, published in the early fifties, whose first volume, pretentiously titled "The Prophet Armed," contained a chapter especially devoted to this topic. According to Deutscher, it appears that none else but Trotskiy "took upon himself the task of creating an army... out of nothing."

Claims that Trotskiy was actually the "key figure" in military building can be seen in the pages of other works on Sovietology. The well-known British historian E.

Carr, for example, writes that Trotskiy was in charge of military operations during the civil war and that it was he who achieved the creation of the new army with help from former tsarist generals.

All this is contrary to actual facts.

It is universally known that L.D. Trotskiy was appointed to the office of people's commissar for military affairs, and subsequently headed the Supreme Military Council, after the Council of People's Commissars relieved N.V. Krylenko of his duties as supreme commander in chief and people's commissar for military affairs. During the civil war, and executing the instructions of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee on the leadership of the military department and the Revolutionary Military Council, Trotskiy—as Vladimir Ilich noted—did much to organize the Red Army and recruit military specialists.

Turning to V.I. Lenin's works and his wartime correspondence, we come across objective assessments of L.D. Trotskiy's activity during the civil war. At the eighth congress, when many members of the "military opposition" claimed that the Central Committee was following Trotskiy's policy in the military sphere and that Trotskiy's policy was nothing but reliance on military specialists, Vladimir Ilich sharply objected:

"In his speech here, Comrade Goloshchekin said: The Central Committee's policy is not implemented by the Military Department. If you voice such accusations, if you as a responsible speaker at the party congress can accuse Trotskiy of failing to implement the Central Committee's policy—these accusations are insane. You cannot adduce even a shadow of proof. If you really were able to prove it, it would mean that both Trotskiy and the Central Committee were useless. What sort of party organization would this be if it were unable to secure the implementation of its policy...?"

This is a very principled comment. As we can see, Vladimir Ilich found it necessary to emphasize that military policy was constantly monitored by the party Central Committee and that Trotskiy, as member of the Central Committee, was bound to implement that military policy. It is a different matter that Trotskiy committed serious mistakes and shortcomings in the practical implementation of the policy.

Let us turn back to that same question of the military specialists. Vladimir Ilich, advocating their broad involvement in military building, deemed that the most important condition of their utilization was the institution of vigilant party-political monitoring over them and the intensification of the proletarian stratum and communist influence in the Army. Trotskiy, while verbally agreeing to this, in practice often ignored the proletarian monitoring of former officers and generals and at times displayed excessive trust in military specialists, often shielding former officers or generals he had appointed to top positions from prevailing forms of monitoring.

Numerous conflicts developed between Trotskiy and members of front or army revolutionary military councils, with administrative mannerisms and rudeness often displayed in relations with people. It was no accident that the Central Committee plenum held after the eighth party congress found it necessary to note in its resolution that the sharp criticism by congress delegates is "a serious warning to Comrade Trotskiy." Trotskiy's serious personal shortcomings were also discussed at a regular Central Committee session, and this was, moreover, mentioned in the resolution that was adopted. Let me cite the passage in question:

"...To point out to Comrade Trotskiy the need for as tactful an attitude as possible toward Communist personnel at the front, since the implementation of the Central Committee's policy in military affairs would be impossible without full, comradely solidarity with them."

There is no need to dwell in detail on Trotskiy's mistaken and, at times, adventurist actions, which were quite firmly cut short by the party Central Committee and by V.I. Lenin personally. This has already been discussed in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. This includes Trotskiy's demand that a number of eminent political instructors on the Eastern Front be shot because they had betrayed the military specialists, and the demand to halt the pursuit of the routed Kolchak beyond the Urals, and the resistance to party Central Committee measures to consolidate the Red Army Supreme Headquarters, and many other incorrect steps.

All these are well-known facts. So let us dwell on another aspect of his activity, less well-covered by our historical literature—his role in the Supreme Military Council, which was the predecessor of the Revolutionary Military Council. It was the party Central Committee's intention that Trotskiy should exercise political leadership of the Supreme Military Council and political monitoring of the tsarist generals working on the council. But here is what M.D. Bonch-Bruyevich, former military leader of the Supreme Military Council, wrote:

"As the Red Army's military leader in the first months of its organization, I did not once receive from Trotskiy the slightest instruction on how to combine the enthusiasm of the broad people's masses with the necessary experience gained during the past war, nor did I discover in him even a semblance of interest in military affairs. At the same time, any one of even the most trivial questions, even questions about where a former general who had become a military specialist was to be appointed and to what work, was readily and thoughtfully resolved by Vladimir Ilich. We old military specialists owe it to Lenin rather than anybody else that we shared the difficult and thorny path with the people from the very first days of the revolution."

Overcoming tremendous hardships and relying on the working class, the Soviet state created a new army within the briefest possible period. It ended the civil war with a 5-million strong regular workers' and peasants' Red Army. The Red Army had over 200,000 commanders, and two-thirds of them were of worker or peasant origin. The rout of imperialism's first "crusade" against the Land of the Soviets proved the tremendous strength of an army created by the revolutionary people and the correctness of the course embarked on by the party in building the Soviet Armed Forces.

Agricultural

CPSU Issues Resolution on Rostov Agriculture

LD241223 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 24 Feb 88

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution on the work of party, Soviet, and economic organs in Rostov Oblast on fulfillment of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions on raising the productivity and stability of agriculture. The document notes a certain increase in the output of basic products in this branch, but it stresses that so far no material changes have taken place in increasing the food resources in the oblast.

Solutions to social problems in the countryside have fallen behind. Many questions remain unanswered about the use of improved lands. Ministries and departments involved with solving these problems are invited to give specific help to the people of Rostov Oblast in increasing the volume of production of grain and other agricultural products.

The resolution will be published tomorrow in the central papers.

Nikonov Tours Kazakhstan, Visits Oblasts

LD110009 Moscow Televison Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Feb 88

[Report by correspondent V. Golubev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Viktor Petrovich Nikonov is in Kazakhstan. He has been acquainting himself with farms in Panfilovskiy Rayon, Taldykurgan Oblast.

[Begin Golubev recording] The collective of the 40 years of October Kolkhoz, which has been managed for about 40 years by Nikolay Nikitich Golovatksiy, twice Hero of Socialist Labor, demonstrates especially clearly the great strength of collective labor and what the potential of team contracting and financial autonomy. The object of the kolkhoz workers' particular pride is this sheep-rearing area, (Armandastar)—Dreamers, in translation—where more than 30,000 sheep are raised each year. Viktor Petrovich Nikonov visited this Komsomol youth complex. The production costs of all the main types of produce are significantly below the plan level. This results in high profits, great profitability, and the opportunity to build a lot for people. [passage omitted]

Viktor Petrovich Nikonov looked around the kolkhoz molodezhnyy agro-settlement. New residents already have received hundreds of fully equipped flats here. For them, there is this trading center, a youth cafe, a consumer services center, a secondary school, and a kindergarten. Let us note briefly that the kolkhoz has nine schools, five children's combines, and eight standard houses of culture.

On the same day, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov visited corn-calibrating works. Virtually all the sovkhozes of the Kazakhstan virgin lands are supplied with seeds from here.

A meeting between Comrade Nikonov and the party and economic aktiv of the southern oblasts of Kazakhstan took place at the House of Culture. Viktor Petrovich Nikonov stressed that over 20 billion rubles have been expended on carrying out land improvement work in Kazakhstan in the last 20 years. The irrigated land is concentrated mainly in the southern oblasts, but poor use is being made of it. The corn harvests are particularly low. The cause is weak technological discipline. Irrigated land, especially in the south, must become a zone of guaranteed production of corn and fodder, as illustrated by the experience of the 20 Years of October Kolkhoz.

Visits Kokchetav Oblast

LD121904 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Viktor Petrovich Nikonov is now in Kazakhstan where he has visited Kokchetav Oblast. Kokchetav Oblast farms have accumulated considerable experience in the comprehensive mechanization of agricultural operations. The production of various machines and tools, which have noticeably reduced the need for machine operators during mass field work, has been mastered in specialized oblast agro-industrial enterprises and sovkhoz workshops. Designers and machine builders ought to pay attention to some kinds of equipment developed by rural machine operators and to implement the production of the best specimens on an industrial scale.

A large section of the exhibition at the permanent information and technical center of the oblast agro-industrial committee which Comrade Nikonov visited is devoted to advanced technologies in reconditioning worn-out spares for agricultural equipment. Several hundred types of various machine blocks and spares are being reconditioned today at enterprises of the oblast agro-industrial complex, thereby alleviating, to some degree, the acuteness of the shortage of new spares.

In Kokchetav Viktor Petrovich Nikonov familiarized himself with the construction of a new residential area, and visited state and cooperative shops.

In conversations with residents, he asked about the living conditions of those working on virgin lands and the issues of food supplies. In Shchuchenskiy Rayon, the CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the experimental settlement of Aleksandrovskiy, familiarized himself with the work of the Shchuchenskaya poultry farm, which is the largest in the virgin land region, and visited the Akzhikbez Sovkhoz.

Addresses Seminar

LD131523 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Feb 88

[Text] Ways of raising the intensification of the agro-industrial complex of the Kazakh SSR and the provision on this basis of steady supply of high-quality and varied food products to the population were examined at zonal republican seminars held 8-13 February. Participating were first secretaries of party obkoms and raykoms, chairmen of oblispolkoms, leaders of the republic's State Agro-Industrial Committee, oblast agro-industrial committees, scientific and research establishments, and kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Comrade Nikonov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary took part in their work.

In the Alma-Ata, Dzhambul, and Tardy Kurgan Oblasts the participants acquainted themselves with the work of a number of party organizations and work collectives, visited animal husbandry farms, Agroprom industrial and processing enterprises, and trade, social, and culture facilities. A detailed conversation took place regarding all directions of the development of the agrarian economy of the southern oblasts of Kazakhstan. Special attention was devoted to the problem of tasks on irrigated lands, aimed at raising production of maize, soya, vegetables, and other crops.

In his speech at the seminar Comrade Nikonov stressed that southern Kazakhstan possesses the most favorable conditions for agricultural production. Therefore, a task is set for the party committees and economic bodies of these oblasts to sharply intensify work and to adopt the most decisive measures for the improvement of utilization of the production potential created in rural areas, to ensure a real breakthrough in increasing the resources of foodstuffs.

At the seminar of the representatives of the northern areas of the republic, which took place in Tselinograd Oblast, issues of rational utilization of large areas of land for a steady increase of plant growing and animal husbandry production and the application of effective methods of raising soil fertility were the focus of attention.

The outcome of the seminars were summed up by Comrade Nikonov in his speech in the Barayev All-Union scientific and research institute of (?grain) growing. He said in particular: If one is to sum up the impressions from the present visit to the republic, then one can make the primary conclusion, namely, the foodstuff supply to towns and villages has improved somewhat over the last 2 years, but to achieve all targets fixed by the food program it is necessary to double the pace of the growth of agro-industrial production.

During a stay in the Kazakh SSR, Comrade Nikonov visited the Novodzhambul phosphor and the Dzhambul superphosphate plants. In discussions with workers and specialists, attention was focused on the necessity of raising the production of phosporous fertilizers to increase grain crop production. The importance of the development of rural private plots at the enterprises was noted.

In Dzhambul and in Kokchetav, the CPSU Central Committee secretary viewed new housing estates and acquainted himself with the work of the state and cooperative trade enterprises.

A meeting took place at the Kazakh SSR economic achievements exhibition with scientists and designers. Topical issues of mechanization of the republican agro-industrial complex were discussed and the necessity of more active implementation of the decision regarding scientific provision of the agro-industrial sphere was stressed.

Comrade Nikonov was accompanied by Comrade Kolbin, Central Committee first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and Comrade Nazarbayev and Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers chairman.

Committee Encourages Individual Stock Breeding

AU171415 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 10 Feb 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"—boldface as published]

[Text] **The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has examined the experience of Zhitomir Oblast party, administrative, and economic organs in stepping up stock-breeding production at individual subsidiary holdings of the population.**

It has been noted that in implementing the decisions of the 27th party congress and of the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, Zhitomir Oblast party, administrative, and economic organs worked energetically to mobilize the village laborers to further step up the output and procurements of stockbreeding produce, and for branch intensification. In 1986-87, the production of meat, milk, eggs, and wool significantly increased, compared with the annual average of the 11th

5-year period, in all categories of farms. The plans for purchases and supplies to union-republic stocks are being fulfilled, and supplies to the population are improving.

Pains have been taken to optimally harmonize the interests of the state, the collective, and individual rural laborers, to step up production mainly in the collective sector, to make fuller use of the potentials of individual subsidiary holdings, and to enhance their cooperation. An appreciable share in the oblast's food resources has been contributed by individual holdings run by citizens. The area in their usage amounts to 8 percent of the total. They are greatly assisted by kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Owing to this fact, in the last 6 years the overall stockbreeding output in the individual sector increased by the equivalent of R55.5 million. Through integrating it with the communal sector, the share of individual subsidiary holdings in the oblast's total stockbreeding production amounted, in terms of value, to 46 percent.

On the initiative of the obkom and the oblispolkom, in 1987 all rural homesteads were surveyed by questionnaires to find out what is holding back the numerical increase in animals and poultry at subsidiary holdings of the population. The results of the questionnaires were used to work out concrete measures for every locality which have been examined at village meetings and approved at farms and at special local soviet sessions. On the basis of generalized materials, a comprehensive program has been worked out in the oblast for developing subsidiary farms run by the population, enterprises, and organization in the period 1987-90. It has been examined and approved at an oblast soviet session. The progress in implementing the program is being constantly monitored by the obkom, the oblispolkom, and basic party organizations.

In conformity with this program, about 5,000 hectares of arable land have been granted to the population from the funds of vacating individual plots. The allotments of coarse fodder to citizens from the 1987 crop increased 30 percent compared with 1986, and those of juicy fodder, twofold. Last year, 6,500 heifers and non-calving young cows were sold to families willing to keep cows. Village farmsteads are being allotted plots of meadows and pastures for longer periods, and this practice induces the holders to raise the productivity of their plots. In the current year, it is planned to sell to the population significantly more piglets and young poultry than last year. Purposeful steps have been taken to improve the breed and quality of animals in individual holding. The posts of deputy chairmen or deputy directors for individual holdings of citizens have been introduced at most kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The steps taken in the oblast have met with approval and support on the part of the population, and have helped increase the purchases of surplus produce in the individual sector. In 1987, the state procurements of milk increased, by 9 percent compared with 1986, and amounted to 786 kilos per cow. The purchases of meat and meat products by consumers societies rose 8 percent.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has approved the work carried out by Zhitomir Oblast party, administrative, and economic organs to step up stockbreeding production at individual subsidiary holdings of the population. Obkoms, gorispolkoms, and the Ukrainian State Agro-Industrial Committee have been instructed to widely disseminate the experience.

Media Report 15-19 Feb Agricultural Developments

LD210516 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 15-19 February. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

15 February

No fileworthy items monitored.

16 February

Sowing of cereal crops has begun in southern Uzbekistan. In the Karshi steppe spring barley is being planted. Preference is being given to local cereal varieties that produce an average of 30 quintals per hectare. (0304)

17 February

Daghestan: checking of the sowing quality of spring crop seeds has been completed. A new strain of maize is being readied for spring fields in the mountainous land—Krasnodarskaya 427. The yield should be up to 10 quintals more per hectare. (0304)

18 February

Farms in the Mari non-Chernozem area have finished repairing the cultivation and sowing machinery, and considerably more fertilizer has been delivered to the fields than was the case at this time last year. (1200)

Spring preparation work is lagging behind schedule in the Kalmyk ASSR, where one tractor in five and one Kirovets tractor in four, as well as a considerable proportion of the seed drills and other cultivation machines, are in need of urgent repairs. The cereal and fodder seeds are of extremely poor quality. On many farms, the seeds are out of condition or have not been sorted. Urgent measures are evidently called for. (1200)

Lucerne sowing has begun in the Central Asian Republics. (1200)

19 February

Specialists of the Belorussian State Agro-Industrial Committee reported on the eve of this broadcast that 99 percent of plows, cultivators, seed drills are already ready for use. Grain harvesting combines' readiness is only 75 percent because of a lack of spare parts. All collective and state farms are fully provided with seeds of spring grain crops and pulses. They have the required quantity of perennial grass seeds for field and meadow sowing. The 1,500 collective and state farms in Belorussia are ready to sow the spring grain acreage with only first-class seeds. Even though the areas to be sown to spring crops are on the whole being increased, this year 9,000 fewer mechanizers will be required for sowing. This is because work is better organized, more powerful equipment is being used, and team contracting is being introduced more widely, virtually at all collective and state farms. (0906)

In the Crimea, 95 percent of tractors, virtually all plows, cultivators, and seed drills are ready for use. The Crimea is suffering from a shortage of spare parts. The Crimea has received bad pea seeds this year, with a germination rate of only 70 percent, or less. The main advantage of sowing during spells of mild weather in February is that an additional yield of 4 to 5 quintals of grain per hectare is obtained. During these spells, and also early in spring, barley, oats, peas, and perennial grasses are sown. Collective and state farms have enough barley and oats seeds and all of them are first-class. (0906)

Military

Further Reportage on Anniversary Jubilee

Foreign Delegations Listed

PM231459 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Single Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Defending the Revolution's Gains"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow's working people and servicemen of the capital's garrison marking the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy was held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses 22 February.

The assembled company applauded the arrival of Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, A.A. Gromyko, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.I. Dolgikh, Yu.D. Maslyukov, N.V. Talyzin, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, A.P. Biryukova, A.F. Dobrynin, A.I. Lukyanov, V.A. Medvedev, and I.V. Kapitonov. Also in the presidium were the leaders of a number of ministries and departments, prominent Soviet military chiefs, war veterans, scientists, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations.

Also present were the military delegations which have come to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy: from Bulgaria headed by Army General D. Dzhurov, BCP Central Committee Politburo member and minister of national defense; from Hungary headed by Colonel General F. Karpati, MSZMP Central Committee member and defense minister; from the SRV headed by Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense; from the GDR headed by Army General H. Kessler SED Central Committee Politburo member and minister of national defense; from the PRK headed by Defense Minister Koy Buntha; from the DPRK headed by Vice Marshal of the Korean People's Army O Chin-u, Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo Presidium member and minister of the People's Armed Forces; from the Republic of Cuba headed by Division General U. Rosales del Toro, candidate member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Politburo and first vice minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces; from the Lao People's Democratic Republic headed by Lieutenant General C. Sai-gnason, Politburo alternate member, Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee secretary, and first deputy defense minister; from Mongolia headed by Colonel General J. Yondon, MPRP Central Committee member and defense minister; from Poland headed by Army General F. Siwicki, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and minister of national defense; from Romania headed by Colonel General V. Milea, RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee candidate member and minister of national defense; from the CSSR headed by Army General M. Vaclavik, CPCZ Central Committee member and minister of national defense; and from the SFRY headed by Fleet Admiral B. Mamula, LCY Central Committee member and federal secretary for national defense.

L.N. Zaykov, Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and Moscow CPSU Gorkom first secretary, opened the meeting.

The state anthem of the Soviet Union was played.

L.N. Zaykov read out the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers greetings message to servicemen and veterans of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces.

Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR defense minister, delivered the report "70 Years on Guard Over Socialism and Peace." [passage omitted]

Zaykov Closing Remarks

LD221944 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1544 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Remarks by Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov at a meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of Soviet Army-Navy Day held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—live]

[Text] Comrades! May I once again congratulate all the servicemen and veterans of the USSR Armed Forces on the nationwide holiday, the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. [applause].

The solemn session is declared closed. [national anthem is played]

Comrades! There will be a big festive concert following the break.

Yazov Hosts Reception

LD231715 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Army General Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR minister of defense, gave a reception today on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy.

Attending the reception were: Comrades Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Chebrikov, Maslyukov, and Baklanov. In the hall were leaders of ministries and departments; commanders; veterans of the Soviet Army and Navy; scholars; and representatives of party, local soviet, and public organizations of the capital. Also present were military delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cambodia, the DPRK, the Republic of Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, which came for celebrations for the 70th anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces.

Also attending were heads of diplomatic missions of socialist countries accredited in the USSR, as well as military, air force, and naval attaches attached to embassies.

Army General Yazov delivered a speech at the reception.

Army General Siwicki, head of the military delegation of the Polish People's Republic, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member, and minister of national defense, made a speech on behalf of the representatives of the armies of socialist countries. The reception passed in a friendly and cordial atmosphere.

Yazov Presents Jubilee Medals

PM241021 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Single Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Presentation of Jubilee Medals"]

[Text] The leadership of the USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate had a meeting in Moscow 22 February with war, labor, and armed forces veterans who have come to the capital to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Army and the Navy.

Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member, USSR minister of defense, and USSR deputy defense ministers presented the "70 Years of the USSR Armed Forces" jubilee medals to a large group of servicemen and veterans.

The USSR defense minister addressed the assembly. The entire 70-year history of the creation and developmnent of the Soviet Army and Navy, he said, is the history of our socialist motherland, its working people, and every Soviet person. Today, too, the Soviet Armed Forces are a school of lofty civic duty, patriotism and internationalism, courage, and fortitude. Through the years millions of Soviet people have been through this school at various times. Army and Navy service becomes in the life of every youth an important stage of active maturation and of the serious testing and all-around tempering of his character.

Army General D.T. Yazov warmly congratulated the recipients and wished them new successes in the noble cause of strengthening the motherland's might.

On the same day Army General D.T. Yazov presented jubilee medals to the military delegation heads who have come to Moscow to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces: Army General D. Dzhurov of Bulgaria, Colonel General F. Karpati of Hungary, Army General Le Duc Anh of the SRV, Army General H. Kessler of the GDR, Koy Buntha of the PRK, Korean People's Army Vice Marshal O Chin-u of the DPRK, Division General U. Rosales del Toro of the Republic of Cuba, Lieutenant General T. Sai-gnason of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Colonel General J. Yondon of Mongolia, Army General F. Siwicki of Poland, Colonel General V. Milea of Romania, Army General M. Vaclavik of the CSSR, and Fleet Admiral B. Mamula of the SFRY. Medals were also presented to delegation members and military attaches of these countries' armed forces.

USSR deputy defense ministers attended the presentation.

Kulikov, Others Receive Awards

PM241035 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Single Edition p 1

[Own correspondent report: "Motherland's Awards Presented"]

[Text] On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR minister of defense, has presented state awards to a group of servicemen. The Order of Lenin was presented to Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces; Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; and Army General A.D. Lizichev, Soviet Army and Navy Main

Political Directorate chief. The Order of the October Revolution was presented to Army General Yu.P. Maksimov, commander in chief of the Strategic Missile Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister.

Army General D.T. Yazov warmly congratulated the recipients on the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces and wished them good health, happiness, and successes in their activity for the good of the motherland.

Officials Lay Wreaths

LD231432 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Zaykov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, Moscow Gorkom first secretary; Army General Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR minister of defense, secretaries and members of the Moscow Gorkom and (?Obkom), heads of Moscow Gorispolkom and Oblispolkom, deputy ministers of defense of the USSR, generals and admirals, war and labor veterans, frontrankers of production, and representatives of the Moscow public laid wreaths at the Lenin mausoleum today on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. Wreaths were also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

Wreaths were laid at the Lenin Mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by military delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Kampuchea, the DPRK, the Republic of Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia who are in Moscow in connection with the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Yazov Congratulates Servicemen

PM231555 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 2

["USSR Defense Minister's Order of the Day No 70, dated Moscow, 23 February 1988"]

[Text] Comrades soldiers and sailors, sergeants and petty officers!

Comrade warrant officers and ensigns!

Comrade officers, generals, and admirals!

Comrade veterans of the Soviet Armed Forces!

Today our people and their servicemen are celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. Their establishment and development are indissolubly linked with our Soviet state's heroic history. The Soviet Armed Forces, created by Lenin's party, have travelled a glorious combat path. In the fierce battles of the civil war and Great Patriotic War they defended the freedom and independence of their socialist motherland and covered themselves with everlasting glory.

By selfless service to the cause of the Great October Revolution, by heroism and courage in the battles against our motherland's enemies, and by the fulfillment of their internationalist duty, Soviet servicemen have won the love of our people and the profound respect of the working people of the socialist countries and all progressive mankind.

The Soviet Army and Navy's anniversary is being celebrated in the conditions of the new stage of restructuring, democratization and radical economic reform, and the accleration of society's scientific and technical and social progress. The Soviet people are putting into practice the strategy of revolutionary renewal of all spheres of Soviet society's life, a strategy devised by the Communist Party.

True to Leninist foreign policy principles, the Communist Party and the Soviet state are firmly and consistently pursuing the course outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress of creating an all-embracing system of international security and reducing the military threat. The treaty recently signed in Washington between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles occupies an important place in this process. The international situation has really begun to improve. The danger of war persists, however, and social revanche remains the core of the West's strategy and militarist programs. The lessons of the past call for the highest vigilance and a readiness to give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor.

The USSR Armed Forces together with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries are vigilantly guarding socialism's gains, peace, and security. The positive processes characteristic of our society as a whole are also gathering momentum in the Soviet Army and Navy. The new political and psychological-moral atmosphere and the atmosphere of business-like efficiency and intolerance of shortcomings are becoming established in military and labor collectives. The activeness and initiative of personnel in ensuring high combat readiness and strengthening organization and discipline are increasing.

Comrade servicemen and veterans of the USSR Armed Forces!

I congratulate you on the nationwide holiday, the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy!

I wish Army and Navy personnel further successes in their combat and political training, the use of modern weaponry and combat hadrware, and in the improvement of field, air, and sea skills and the all-around strengthening of military discipline.

I wish USSR Armed Forces' veterans good health and active participation in the affairs of the revolutionary restructuring and renewal of all aspects of society's life.

To mark the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy, I order:

That a festive firework display be held today, 23 February 1988, at 2100 hours local time, in the capital of our motherland, the hero-city of Moscow, the union republic capitals, the hero-cities of Leningrad, Volgograd, Odessa, Sevastopol, Novorossiysk, Kerch, Tula, Smolensk, and Murmansk, the hero-fortress of Brest, and also the cities of Kaliningrad, Lvov, Rostov-na-Donu, Kuybyshev, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Chita, Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, and Severomorsk.

Long live the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy!

Long live the heroic Soviet people and their tried and tested vanguard, the Leninist CPSU!

Army General D. Yazov, USSR defense minister

Yazov, Ligachev Attend Meeting

PM231529 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 88 p 2

[Own correspondent report: "Komsomol Teleprinter"]

[Text] On the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy representatives of the "Gaydarovets," "Zarnitsa," and "Orlenok" army youth competitions, military-patriotic associations, and DOSAAF clubs and voluntary first aid workers involved in the celebrations assembled in the capital 19 February and met with Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR defense minister, in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The minister wished the activists and the organizers of the army youth movement success in training young people to defend the homeland and implement the tasks set by the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum. Medals were conferred on the country's best army youth subunits in the Grand Kremlin Palace's Georgiyevskiy Hall.

Army General A.D. Lizichev, Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate chief, and Lieutenant General of Aviation (Retired) G.T. Beregovoy, Komsomol Central Committee secretary, commander in chief of the All-Union "Orlenok" Army Youth Game, and twice Hero of the Soviet Union, took part in the meeting.

Suslov Chairs Celebration

OW230401 Khabarovsk Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] At this moment, a solemn meeting of representatives of the working people of the kray center and troops of the Khabarovsk Garrison devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy is being held at the district Soviet Army Officers Club. The meeting was opened by Boris Nikolayevich Suslov, Khabarovsk Gorkom first secretary. He then gave the floor to the kraykom first secretary, who read the greeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers to troops and veterans of the Soviet Armed Forces in connection with the notable holiday—the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy.

A report: 70 Years in Defense of Peace and Socialism, is currently being delivered by Colonel General Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, commander of troops of the Red Banner Far East Military District.

Lushev on Duty, Courage, Military Jubilee

PM231335 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 88 First Edition p 2

[Article by Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister: "Formations of Duty and Courage. On the 70th Anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces"]

[Text] It was 7 decades ago that Lenin's appeal "The Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!" echoed like a tocsin over the young Soviet republic, and the people's masses responded to it with tremendous patriotic enthusiasm, rising to defend the victorious revolution.

January 1918. The Mikhaylovskiy Riding School in Petrograd. A vast hall, decorated with red banners and posters, filled to capacity with volunteer soldiers from a socialist detachment on its way to the front. Ilich's words echo in the ensuing silence:

"I greet you, the first volunteer heroes of the socialist army, who will create a strong revolutionary army. This army will be called upon to protect the gains of the revolution, our people's power, the soviets of soldiers', workers', and peasants' deputies, and the entire new and truly democratic system from all enemies of the people who are now using all means to kill the revolution."

Created, educated, and led by the Communist Party, the Soviet Armed Forces, whose 70th birthday is approaching, share the life of the people. The celebration of the birthday of the Soviet Army and Navy is an occasion to review their combat readiness, an emotional opportunity to look back and mentally leaf through the pages of their heroic history, the annals of struggles and victories, of feats and glory.

Soldiers from the Army of October.... They did not have it easy, those who, during the Civil War, engaged in an unequal battle against an enemy who was trying to stifle socialism while it was still in its cradle. The largest imperialist powers joined the White Guards against the proletarian revolution. In their struggle against the Land of the Soviets and the still weak Workers' and Peasants' Red Army they calculated on their severalfold superiority in arms, on blockade and bloody terror. They miscalculated, however. Narva and Pskov, Petrograd and Tsaritsyn, Kakhovka and Perekop, Volochayevka and Spassk—these are all landmarks on a long path, symbols of the unbending revolutionary spirit, courage, and loyalty to duty of the Red soldiers and commanders whose immortal feats have been perpetuated by the people in tales, legends, and songs.

The Great Patriotic War turned into a grim trial for us, a time when fascist Germany, reared by international imperialism, unleashed a blow of monstrous power upon our country which had only just healed the wounds and had only just recovered from devastation and famine. But the Soviet Army and Navy, led by Lenin's party and relying on the support of the whole people, not only withstood this blow but also pulverized Hitler's war machine and fittingly performed their patriotic and international mission. There were 607 enemy divisions routed and captured on the Soviet-German front. This fact alone offers eloquent proof of the scale of the battle against fascism and of the Soviet soldier's strength of spirit, heroism, and skill.

Many people now speak and write about wartime events and analyze the causes of our failures, especially in the 1st year of the war. This is correct, there must be neither "blank spots" nor closed pages in the interpretation of history. But at the same time, it is impermissible for people without knowledge of the specific military and historical situation to make a tasty meal of individual—negative as a rule—facts and incidents, and at times even serious issues, concerning the gain of our victory in the Great Patriotic War. Yes, history does not tolerate "blank spots," but neither does it tolerate time-serving misrepresentations and speculations or dubious assessments and conclusions. The truth is that the Soviet people, as M.S. Gorbachev's report at the festive session devoted to the Great October's 70th anniversary noted, did not falter or bend—neither under the blows of initial failures and defeats, nor under the burden of millions of deaths, torments, and suffering. They firmly believed in the future victory from the very first days of the war. Whether in a soldier's uniform or in a worker's protective clothing, they did everything up to and beyond the limit of human endurance to bring this long-awaited day closer.

In the face of the mortal danger hanging over the country, the Communist Party shouldered the entire burden of the historical responsibility for the motherland's destiny. The Communists were invariably at those places where the going was toughest, wherever the outcome of battles was being decided.

The Great Patriotic War fully displayed the power of Soviet arms and revealed the advantages of Soviet military science and art of warfare, the talent of outstanding troop leaders who had emerged from the midst of the people and were educated by the party, like G.K. Zhukov, A.M. Vasilevskiy, K.K. Rokossovskiy, I.S. Konev, other celebrated marshals, generals, and admirals, and thousands of officers, both commanders and political instructors. But the main burden of the war was borne by the ordinary Soviet soldier. The grandeur of the feat they accomplished cannot be erased by the passage of time. This feat will live forever in the grateful memory of their descendants.

Following the Great Patriotic War, the combat might of the Soviet Army and Navy grew and strengthened in parallel with the growth of the motherland's economic and defense might. The country forged modern weapons, and the Army and Navy mastered them with full exertion of effort. The establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO, was a historical achievement by socialism. This strengthened the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces, helped to strengthen international stability, and undermined the calculations by aggressive circles of imperialism to gain victory in a world nuclear war.

Now it is clear to everyone that the new political thinking is not a simple political declaration. It manifests itself in specific deeds and practical actions, including in the military sphere. Its spirit imbues the military doctrine of Warsaw Pact states and this doctrine's defensive orientation. The new political thinking is making headway in international relations. A convincing confirmation of this was provided by the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles which was signed in Washington. A step of historical dimensions was taken, and it already exerts a favorable influence on the political climate in the planet, enhances mutual trust between states, and reinforces the hope for the triumph of realism and common sense in today's complex, contradictory, but interlinked world.

In conformity with the principles of the CPSU's foreign policy and our military doctrine's stipulations, the building and training of the Soviet Armed Forces today are taking place with due consideration for the demands of defense sufficiency. This means their structure and the quantity and quality of weapons available at their disposal are determined by the actual requirements necessary to ensure reliable defense. We are not pursuing military superiority, but we will not allow anyone to gain military superiority over us.

The guard is changing with the passage of time. Teenagers born in 1969—sons and grandsons of the heroes from the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War—have already donned the soldier's uniform. But they have to perform the same most important task—to vigilantly

and reliably defend the motherland and socialism and to fittingly carry into the future the baton of the ideals bequeathed by Great October. Army and Navy servicemen demonstrate their loyalty to the heroic traditions by selfless military labor, by their masterly command of the most complex combat machines, missile complexes and radar systems, nuclear-powered missile and multipurpose submarines, various types of combat and transport aircraft, and helicopters with highly effective armament, all of which have been developed on the basis of the latest achievements of science. When the fatherland and the patriotic and international duty demand it, they perform feats worthy of their fathers' and grandfathers' military glory.

There are many examples testifying to the fact that the present defenders of the motherland are marching along the path of feats and heroism. Surely, the around-the-world cruises by submerged Soviet nuclear-powered submarines and the courageous actions by our naval servicemen in the Persian Gulf to ensure the defense of civilian Soviet ships are akin to feats. As is the selflessness of sappers who have defused thousands of bombs and shells left behind after the war. How about the courage and heroism displayed by Soviet servicemen while liquidating the consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident or in providing assistance to the people of friendly Afghanistan! The names of Heroes of the Soviet Union Colonel General V. Pikalov, Major General of Aviation N. Antoshkin, Officers R. Aushev, I. Zaporozhan, F. Pugachev, G. Kuchkin, and N. Malyshev, Sergeant I. Chmurov, and many others are now known all over the country.

The title of Hero of the Soviet Union was quite recently awarded to Guards Lieutenant Colonel Valeriy Aleksandrovich Vostrotin. Son of a worker and former frontline fighter, he won a Gold Star on graduation from the Ryazan Higher Airborne Command School and performed his international duty in Afghanistan. He was wounded twice. He was awarded on Order of the Red Banner and two Orders of the Red Star for courage and valor. Following graduation from the M.V. Frunze Military Academy, he took over command of a unit which became one of the best Airborne Forces units a year later. But the knowledge that blood was still being shed on the land of the friendly republic and that his combat experience could be put to better use there did not let him rest. Guards Lt Col Vostrotin was again appointed to duty in Afghanistan. He happened to rejoin his original unit, became its commander, and performed another feat. These are the people that make our army strong.

Today the Armed Forces are undergoing restructuring. It is permeating literally all cells of the Army organism. A vital boost has been given to combat and political training. The stagnation phenomena and stereotypes in military cadres' work, which had accumulated over the years, are being increasingly boldly demolished. Restructuring has brought to light new frontiers of Army and Navy reality, and this has resulted from the strengthening of one-man command and from the expansion of glasnost and democratic principles and the activation of the human factor. Commanders, political organs, and party and Komsomol organizations are striving to achieve the main goal: To inspire the entire personnel for the proper solution of the tasks facing the Armed Forces, to radically improve discipline and organization, and to enhance combat readiness.

Celebrating the glorious 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces, the Army and Navy servicemen clearly realize the enormous responsibility they bear before their people. Surrounded by the people's solicitude and rallied round the Communist Party, they are doing everything to ensure reliable defense of Soviet people's peaceful labor and the great gains of socialism.

Kulikov on 'Defense Shield, Reliable Guard'

PM231027 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Feb 88 Second Edition p 1, 2

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces: "The Guard of Peace and Socialism"]

[Text] Seventy years ago, in February 1918, the Soviet Armed Forces were born. Deep meaning and a certain inevitability attaches to the fact that this jubilee is being marked so soon after the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Born of the October, the Soviet Army and Navy have been throughout their history and remain a powerful defensive shield and reliable guard of the Soviet people's peaceful creative labor.

"Any revolution has worth only if it is able to defend itself," V.I. Lenin pointed out. Essentially, this thesis served as the Communist Party's guideline in the organization of the armed defense of the Soviet Republic and the creation of the Soviet Armed Forces. The elaboration of the military program of the proletarian revolution, the teaching about on defense of the socialist fatherland, the basic guidelines for military building, and Soviet military doctrine and science are linked with Lenin's name and the activity of the party.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the toppled exploiting classes, relying on the support of international capital and with the latter's direct participation, embarked on the road of overt armed struggle against Soviet power. Naturally, the workers of the Red Guard and the revolutionary detachments of sailors and soldiers were clearly not enough to defend the young Soviet state. On 28 January 1918 the Council of People's Commissars adopted a decree on the organization of a Red Army of workers and peasants and on 11 February of the same year a decree on the creation of a Red Navy of workers and peasants.

Subsequent events revealed how opportune these steps had been. On 18 February 1918 the troops of Kaiser's Germany, violating the truce, launched a broad offensive along the whole front. This posed a mortal threat to the Soviet Republic and to revolutionary Petrograd. On 22 February the decree-appeal "The Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!" drawn up by V.I. Lenin was published. Its main content was an appeal to rebuff the enemy. On the next day the enlistment of the working people in the Red Army began. The first revolutionary units left for the front immediately. Staunchly repulsing the onslaught of the interventionists, they barred their path to Petrograd.

The memorable 23 February, the day of the beginning of the active mobilization of the working people for the defense of the Land of the Soviets, the mass enlistment of workers and peasants in the Red Army, and the formation of the new army's first units and detachments which offered courageous resistance to imperial Germany's forces, entered the history of our motherland as a nationwide holiday—Soviet Army and Navy Day.

For more than 3 years the Red Army and Navy waged an embittered struggle against the White Guards and interventionists. Emerging victorious from this struggle, they convincingly demonstrated the tremendous vitality of socialism.

In the battles and clashes for Soviet power talented military leaders and political workers rose from the midst of the people's masses and the ranks of the military specialists of the old Russian Army. They included M.V. Frunze, C.M. Budennyy, K.Ye. Voroshilov, V.K. Blyukher, M.N. Tukhachevskiy, I.P. Uborevich, Ya.V. Gamarnik, S.M. Kirov, A.I. Yegorov, S.S. Kamenev, and others. The feats of the legendary heroes V.I. Chapayev, N.S. Shchors, A.Ya. Parkhomenko, G.I. Kotovskiy, S.G. Lazo, and other courageous fighters and commanders will live on in people's memory for ever.

During the the civil war and the repulsion of the imperialist intervention the strength of the international solidarity of the world's working people vividly manifested itself. At different times between 250,000 and 300,000 internationalist fighters, envoys of the working people from many of the world's countries, fought in the ranks of the Red Army on the fronts of the civil war.

The victory in the civil war made it possible for Soviet people to embark on peaceful socialist building. Headed by the Communist Party, they carried out the industrialization of the country, the collectivization of agriculture, and a cultural revolution within a historically short period.

Together with the whole country, the Soviet Armed Forces developed and strengthened. They confidently ensured the defense of the socialist gains. This was all the more necessary since imperialism had not abandoned its plans to destroy socialism by force. The provocation on the Chinese-Eastern Railroad (1929), the Japanese militarists' acts of aggression at Khasan Lake and Halhin Gol (1938 and 1939), and the Soviet-Finnish conflict (1939-1940) which was provoked by imperialist circles—were all links in the same chain. The Red Army dealt a crushing blow to the intrigues of international imperialism.

Aware that a decisive clash with imperialism could not be avoided, the party and the government took resolute steps to prepare the country and the army to repulse the aggression. However, by the time of fascist Germany's attack, the Soviet Union had not been able to fully resolve the questions connected with the country's defense.

Nonetheless, everything that had been done by the beginning of the war was of tremendous value. Despite the colossal blow dealt to the Soviet Union 22 June 1941 by fascist Germany and its satellites, they were unable to realize their plan of a "blitzkrieg." In a difficult situation, in conditions of temporary setbacks and difficulties, Soviet servicemen displayed mass heroism and selfless devotion to the motherland. They inflicted serious damage on the enemy, thwarted his strategic plans, and laid the basis for the future victory. Deep in the hinterland, Soviet workers managed within a very short time to switch the national economy to a war footing and provide the Armed Forces with eveything necessary to defeat the enemy.

The aggressor's hopes for success were ultimately buried in the course of the battle of Moscow. Here the Soviet Army launched a resolute counteroffensive. Inflicting a crushing defeat on the enemy, it debunked the myth of the "invincibility" of Hitler's Wehrmacht.

Subsequently the Soviet Army won a series of impressive victories over the German fascist troops at Stalingrad, the Kursk Bulge, and the battle for the Dnepr. These victories marked the crucial turning point in the Great Patriotic War and World War II. Under the powerful blows of the Soviet Armed Forces, the enemy was pushed further and further westward. From 1944 Soviet internationalist soldiers, having liberated their native land, embarked on the liberation of the peoples of other European countries from fascism. They discharged their great liberating mission with honor.

Thanks to the heroic efforts of all the Soviet people and the courage, staunchness, and selflessness of the commanders and men of the Soviet Army, 1945 became the year of the Great Victory. Routing the enemy, our people and their Armed Forces under the leadership of the party upheld the freedom and independence of the socialist motherland and defended the cause of October. They made a decisive contribution to the victory over fascist Germany and its allies and to saving world civilization and discharged their patriotic and international duty with honor. This was their greatest service to mankind.

Complying with its alliance obligations, the Soviet Union came out against militarist Japan in August 1945. During a 23-day offensive our Armed Forces, assisted by the forces of the Mongolian People's Republic, routed the 1,000,0000-strong Kwangtung army, thus making a decisive contribution to the victory over Japan and to ending World War II.

In the heat of the battles and clashes the glorious revolutionary traditions of international fraternity in arms were strengthened and tempered. Military units and partisan armies and detachments from Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, patriots from Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and Hungary, and resistance movement and antifascist underground participants fought selflessly against the fascist invaders.

The victory which the Soviet people won in the Great Patriotic War was deeply logical. It fully revealed the advantages of socialism, its tremendous economic, sociopolitical, spiritual, and purely military potential.

The Communist Party was the inspiration and organizer behind the victory. It ensured the unity of political, economic, and military-strategic leadership, unity between the Army and the people, between the front and the rear, and became a truly fighting party.

The victory in the Great Patriotic War also revealed the high level of Soviet military science and military art. The Armed Forces carried out brilliantly more than 50 strategic operations, over 250 front-line operations, a multitude of army operations, and thousands of combat actions. These vividly showed up the talent of outstanding military leaders G.K. Zhukovskiy, K.K. Rokossovskiy, I.Kh. Bagramyan, A.M. Vasilevskiy, N.F. Batunin, K.A. Vershinin, L.A. Govorov, A.I. Yeremenko, A.G. Golovko, I.S. Isakov, I.S. Konev, R.Ya. Malinovskiy, K.A. Meretskov, F.I. Tolbukhin, I.Ye. Petrov, and other famous marshals and generals.

In the battles of the Great Patriotic War the Soviet servicemen's selfless devotion to the party, the people, and the motherland was demonstrated with great force. This is the very reason why the Soviet Army was an army of mass heroism. More than 11,000 people were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, of which 86 were women. State awards were presented to a total of 7 million servicemen. Some 11,000 had division or regiment orders bestowed on them.

The war ended. It seemed that the prospect of a just peace that would last for ever had opened up before mankind. However, aggressive imperialist circles headed by the United States and motivated by the idea of social revenge launched preparations for a new war against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. They started nuclear blackmail, initiated the "cold war," and set up the aggressive NATO bloc.

In these circumstances the CPSU, the Soviet Government, and the people of our country were forced to pay special attention to questions of the defense of socialism, the buildup of defense might, the strengthening of the security of the USSR and the entire socialist community, and the enhancement of the combat readiness of the Armed Forces. Through Soviet people's efforts nuclear weapons, powerful delivery vehicles, and other types of modern hardware and equipment were created and supplied to the forces.

Great importance for the strengthening of the positions of peace and socialism attached to the creation of the Warsaw Pact Organization in 1955. Pooling their political and military efforts, the socialist community states ensured firm collective defense and erected reliable barrier in the path of the newly-emerged pretenders to world supremacy.

A historic achievement of socialism was the establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Orgnization and NATO. This strengthened the positions of the USSR, the other socialist countries, and all progressive forces and thwarted the plans of the aggressive imperialist circles for a victory in a nuclear world war.

An important milestone of the USSR's struggle for peace was the 27th CPSU Congress. It offered mankind a new concept of international security, a political philosophy of peace, and a platform of concrete actions to achieve it. An appeal rang out from the rostrum of the party forum urging the peoples and governments of all countries to master the new political thinking as the only possible choice in the nuclear space age. Its ideas and principles are increasingly becoming part of the practice of international relations.

The most obvious proof of this was the visit to the United States by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. During this visit a historic breakthrough was achieved in the sphere of nuclear arms reduction. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed. All Soviet and U.S. ground-launched missiles (more than 2,500) with a range between 500 and 5,500 km are to be destroyed. The prospect of the conclusion of an agreement on a 50-percent cut in the strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States is taking on distinct contours. The Soviet initiative aimed at a political settlement of the military conflict in Afghanistan is also evidence of the new political thinking, of a new modern perception of the world.

At the same time the question of the elimination of the nuclear threat remains at the focus of international life. The most reactionary imperialist forces have not given up their attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR and its allies. The U.S. Administration is preparing to extend the arms race to space. Measures to

"compensate" for the U.S. missiles which are subject to destruction on the European continent and plans for the additional deployment of new long-range nuclear systems which are not covered by the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles (sea- and air-launched cruise missiles) are being discussed at NATO headquarters.

In this situation and taking account of the persisting threat of a new war being unleashed by imperialism, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government take constant care to maintain the defense potential of the Soviet Armed Forces at the requisite level.

In implementing measures for the further development and strengthening of its Armed Forces, the USSR strictly follows the letter and spirit of the fundamental provisions of the defensive military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states. In accordance with this doctrine the combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces is maintained at a level commensurate with the threat of aggression and with the observance of the principle of sufficiency for defense. All branches of the Armed Forces and categories of troops are developing within limits defined exclusively by these requirements.

They are equipped with modern weapons and combat hardware which constitute the material basis of their combat might. Profound qualitative changes are taking place in the sphere of the inculcation of professional skills and physical and psychological training. This is largely promoted by socialist competition organized under the motto "Selfless military labor, exemplary service, and utmost discipline—this is our contribution to the cause of the defense of the motherland."

A big upsurge in the political, social, and labor activeness of Armed Forces servicemen, as of all Soviet people, has been brought about by the results of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum and preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. The struggle for the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the aims and tasks of restructuring, which has encompassed all spheres of Army and Navy life and activity, is gathering momentum everywhere.

The restructuring is aimed at ensuring a high level of combat readiness among troops and naval forces, improving servicemen's training and education, linking the achievements of military science more closely with practice, strengthening discipline, and improving work with military cadres. This is all the more important since a varied contingent of young people is joining the Army and Navy. A certain section of draftees display political naivete, especially regarding the imperialist threat, poor physical tempering, and an insufficient level of training in military and technical specialities, and this was rightly noted at the 10th All-Union DOSAAF Congress.

The preparation of young people for service, for the fulfillment of the honorable duty of the defense of the motherland, is a cause which concerns the entire people. The family, the school, the Komsomol, and the labor collective entirely determine what the young people who join the Army are like and what persuasions and skills they bring with them. If a sense of duty, conscience, comradeship, and discipline is instilled in people from an early age, then in the military family it will be further strengthened, become more mature, and turn into a moral norm for the rest of their life.

The young generation of the defenders of the motherland is worthily continuing the traditions of the fighters of the civil and the Great Patriotic Wars. The servicemen are greeting the glorious 70th jubilee of the Army and Navy with new successes in combat and political training and the fulfillment of their patriotic and international duty. Dozens of them have been awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union for their military labor, including feats on Afghan soil, and thousands have been decorated with orders and medals. Far from home shores, in the dangerous latitudes of the Persian Gulf, our Navy men are exemplarily fulfilling the task assigned to them by the government.

The might of the Armed Forces is directed exclusively at the benefit of socialism, at the benefit of peace. The Armed Forces are vigilantly standing guard over the revolutionary gains of the Soviet people and firmly maintaining high combat readiness guaranteeing that any attack from outside will be immediately rebuffed.

DOSAAF Official Views Military Celebrations

LD231143 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] The traditional All-Union Month of Mass Defense Work came to an end today. It was held in labor collectives, trade union, Komsomol and DOSAAF organizations in honor of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. Lieutenant General Masyeykin, deputy chairman of the Central Committee of the USSR DOSAAF, said that during the month, military and military technology knowledge was widely propagated and the requirements of the party were explained regarding consolidation of the defense capacity of the USSR and its Armed Forces. There were rallies of conscripts, youth meetings with Army and Navy servicemen, veterans and reserve servicemen and all those who have performed their internationalist duty in the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

Central Committee Adopts Veterans' Resolution

LD231005 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Today, on the day of the Soviet Army and Navy, we have received a report that the CPSU Central Committee has examined the results of the all-union assembly of young servicemen of the reserve. The resolution

adopted notes that recently the social and political level of activity of young people who have been through service in the USSR's Armed Forces has risen noticeably. Young men dismissed into the reserve are energetically involving themselves in sociopolitical life in labor and education collectives. The young people who have carried out their internationalist duty in Afghanistan are showing themselves to be the most active.

In a number of the country's republics and oblasts, clubs and councils of internationalist servicemen are being formed. The activities of the majority of them are supported by official organizations and gain the recognition of the public. At the same time, the resolution says, there are instances of attempts by some persons with ideologically detrimental views and excessive personal ambitions to lead this category of young people away from socially meaningful affairs, to ear them away from the Komsomol and to set them against veterans of war and labor, speculating in this on the difficulties of the progress of restructuring, on the maximalism typical of youth, and on cases of formalism in the implementation of benefits and privileges established by the state for internationalist servicemen.

There was a committed debate at the assembly about the problems of training young people for service in the USSR's Armed Forces. Shortcomings in the way mass defense and sports work is arranged among the population were noted. The assembly drafted and adopted by democratic means a final document, directed toward the active utilization of the knowledge and experience of former servicemen in the upbringing of young people and adolescents.

The CPSU Central Committee has endorsed measures undertaken by the VLKSM Central Committee to develop the level of activity of young servicemen of the reserve in military-patriotic work among young people. Ministries and departments have been instructed to examine the proposals of the participants in the all-union assembly of young servicemen of the reserve, to implement relevant measures to realize them and render help to the VLKSM Central Committee and the action committee of the former servicemen in the preparations for the next assembly on issues of further stepping up of participation by servicemen of the reserve in military-patriotic education of young people and adolescents at the places where they study and live.

The CPSU Central Committee has drawn the attention of party, state, trade-union, and Komsomol bodies to the impermissibility of cases of formalistic, unsympathetic attitudes to former internationalist servicemen who have been wounded or scarred and to the families and memory of those who have perished, and it has demanded that the necessary measures be adopted to implement the benefits and privileges for them established by the state.

MOSCOW NEWS Interviews General Tretyak

PM231305 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 8, 21 Feb 88 p 12

[Interview with USSR Air Defense Forces Commander in Chief General Ivan Tretyak by Yuriy Teplyakov: "Reliable Defence First and Foremost"—first paragraph introductory]

[Text] On the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army, Ivan Tretyak, General of the Army, Commander-in-Chief of the Air Defence Forces, Deputy minister of Ddfence of the USSR, answered questions from an "MN" correspondent.

[Teplyakov] This is a time of perestroyka, glasnost and democratization in politics, the economy and in the social field. Does this also apply to the army? What effect have all these processes had on the Soviet Armed Forces? Or maybe, this section of our society doesn't need any changes, because here everything is done according to the regulations, as they say? And, then, the main task remains the same—to defend the country, isn't that so?

[Tretyak] The task remains the same as before, of course. But the methods of carrying it out are changing. Present-day Soviet military doctrine has two aims. Firstly, to prevent war from breaking out. Secondly, always to be ready to rebuff the aggressor. These are the principles both of our politics and of our military development.

As before, our war operations remain mostly defensive. But you'll agree that if you only defend yourself, you'll probably not smash the enemy. So, the troops have also to be well versed in the art of attack. This aspect of our doctrine is completely distorted in the West. Well, you can distort anything out of all proportion, especially if you are an expert. But I repeat that the army must be able to do everything in order to fulfil its duty to society. Every day and every hour in the life of Soviet troops is dedicated to this.

But life changes in the army, too, of course. Perestroyka is an objective necessity for the Armed Forces as well. We must bring about a turn towards human personality, towards the improvement of the social and spiritual side of the military life. How does it look in everyday life? We are rejecting imperative forms more and more often. Instead of ordering people to the hardest assignments, we look for and find volunteers.

Everyone in the country is for perestroyka, and there are quite enough speakers in favour of it. But far from everybody is hurrying to change their approach. We've become too used to waiting for some special directives and are acting as a brake on perestroyka instead. What is to be done? I see it this way: rather than change the Regulations, we should change the conscience of those who ae fulfilling the Regulations. There should be more personal initiative, more personal responsibility for the common cause. Then it will become clear at once who is

who in our collective military work. This should be the law both for the soldier and for the Marshal. Everyone is equal before the Motherland.

The principle of unity of command is a specific feature of army service. But it does not exclude democratic elements. More than that—it takes support in them. Take, for example, general meetings of servicemen. They are the finest barometer of public opinion. How can a commander fail to take into account the modds and needs of his subordinates? It is simply impossible to make a correct decision without this. But we need to create the conditions where truth itself and not a declaration becomes a reality, where democracy would not depend on the personal characteristics of this or that chief.

[Teplyakov] How does the army regard the new political thinking since this touches not only upon the evolution of the military doctrine—but also upon the pattern and even the numbers of Armed Forces? And this could effect the life of thousands upon thousands of regular military men. What is your opinion on this account, both as one of the top chiefs of the Soviet Army and as someone who donned a soldier's trench coat nearly half a century ago?

[Tretyak] The new political thinking, as we know, is already yielding weighty results in the international arena. It is enough to mention the USSR-USA Treaty on the liquidation of two classes of nuclear missiles, signed late last year.

If the cause of peace continues to follow the same road, then it is true that soon colossal changes may take place in the army, too. Many officers will take off their uniforms and put on plain clothes. I'm sure they will not be superfluous in the civil sectors of the economy, and their knowledge will be used worthily.

It would be superb if it all happened that way. But we must not forget the main thing when dealing with a problem—the country's defence must be absolute.

But we shouldn't be lured by apparent benefits. I'm saying that because we've already had sorry experiences of this kind. At the end of the 50s the USSR reduced its army unilaterally by 1.2 million men. The economists estimated that this enabled us to double the size of old-age pensions and to set up 10 house-building plants. On the surface it looked rather convincing. But only on the surface. As a professional military man, I'll tell you that the step was a rash one, it dealt a terrible blow at our defence capacity, and at our officer personnel. At the time skilled personnel, with tremendous combat know-how left the army. The army officer list prestige in the eyes of young people. To be honest, we are still feeling this. Therefore, any changes in our army should be considered a thousand times over before they are decided upon. Temporary benefits are a great lure. But I repeat once again—the most important thing is to have a reliable defence. If we were not so strong, then imperialism would not have resisted an attempt to change the world of today. The principle of sufficient defence is unshakable. We must have as much force as is necessary to guarantee reliably the security of the USSR and our allies.

[Teplyakov] The army is a sacred concept for our people. This is only natural: we owe our existence, our future to it. Maybe that's why we've built up an image of it in our minds as a pure, infallible and reliable army. But you said in an interview that you're quite worried about many things in today's officers (and maybe not only in the officers). What exactly worries you? And, in a broader sense, does the army, in your opinion, have any problems that should be dealt with by the people?

[Tretyak] Like any living organism, the army, of course, has its own problems. We deal with some of them on our own and with others—with the aid of the entire country. I am still convinced that an officer is the chief figure in the army. Unfortunately, people become officers not always because it is their vocation. There's no secret made of the fact that it is much easier to join a military school that a university, and not because the demands are lower, but because of the shortage of the personnel. We take people on in the hope that we'll make them officers in the course of training. Young people, when encountering difficulties, sometimes give up and recognize that they made a mistake. But it is too late to change anything, and service becomes a torment for them. Of course, you cannot expect them to be zealous. I repeat—a man must apply for the officer's rank through vocation, this profession should be a dream for him.

I'm also worried about the health of future officers. For example, we sign up 100 men to serve in the Air Force, but only ten of them can really fly. The physical education for young people is not on a par with the demands which army service places on them today. Here, as they say, everybody must think what should be done.

Today much is being written to combat the problem of cruelty to young soldiers on the part of second-year servicemen. But you must understand that if such things happen, it is not the army that is guilty, it is rather a reflection of the education the young men are getting in the conventional, pre-army environment. I can assure you there was no cruelty in the army before the 60s. And that's exactly what you and I must think about. This is awful for us and that's why we react so painfully to each case. The army was always a sample of purity in human relations, a model of friendship among people who are involved in doing a common and, I stress, a very hard job.

[Teplyakov] You started your combat career in autumn 1941 near Moscow. You finished on the shores of the Baltic in May 1945. I've talked with Marshals and privates, and all of them, when remembering the war, recollect not the festive, colourful salutes, but its most

difficult days—because the pain from the wounds lasts all life long. Why, then, are people who write about the war so much blamed for putting in the forefront only the tragic side, especially the initial period of the Great Patriotic War, when we suffered such tremendous losses? Can it be that "theoreticians of history" are right? Can it be that we've already learned all the lessons from the experience of the Great Patriotic war and that we now only have to remember "about valiance, about feats and about fame", as a poet once said?

[Tretyak] Now should you write about the war? The main thing is to write honestly. One should write about it without overlooking the tragedies, without leaving blank spots and without omitting the names, not only of major military leaders, but of direct participants as well—generals, officers and soldiers. We are, as yet, very much indebted to the junior officers who played a leading role in the war. The pilot, the tank commander, the commander of a company of a battalion—these people have not yet been depicted in books. But it was precisely this category of military personnel that was directly involved in hostilities, in the very front line, and that suffered the greatest losses. I was wounded when I was a platoon commander and a CO of a battalion and a regiment.

If we put in the forefront only the tragic side, would we be giving the fullest possible description of the events? And are the references by writers like Viktor Astafyev to some special "trench truth" justified? I know from my own experience that we had but one truth—the truth of fighting the enemy.

Of course, the initial period of the war brought us much grief and disillusionment. There were mistakes and tragic episodes, but there were also feats, valiance and fame.

The lessons of the war are grim lessons. Much has been said and written about them, but an all-round, objective expression of all the hostilities is necessary. We learned the chief lesson—to be ready to defend the Soviet state. [Teplyakov] Time brings a profound realization of past facts and events. This is an axiom. But, regarding war history, many people offer "their own version" of realization—it is possible to speak about the events, but it is impossible to speak about the heroes of the past, or rather about their mistakes. Because this would apparently be harmful for the patriotic education of young people. Yet maybe only the truth is the best educator?

[Tretyak] Assessments of events, of the activities of various personalities and their mistakes or confusions can only be made using an objective class approach and should not be based on personal views. Lenin demonstrated an example of such an approach in his Letter to the Congress, in which he gave a principled evaluation of the leaders of that period. Our Party is acting in the same way today. Just remember the conclusions and assessments voiced in Mikhail Gorbachev's report October and Perestroyka: the Revolution Continues, and you'll realize that keeping silent about mistakes will not benefit education. We were not aware of 90 per cent of the events that took place in our country. Should we know the entire truth? We should.

[Teplyakov] Several years ago, in this very room your predecessor, a superb wartime pilot, was telling me: "The air defence troops are safeguarding the skies of our Motherland—no foreign bird will fly through them" And we believed it. Then came the incident when Rust landed near Red Square. Many people got the impression that this was not simply an incident. And what did you think when you were given command of the Air Defence Forces?

[Tretyak] When assessing the Rust incident we should not go to extremes and judge the combat ability of the Air Defence Forces on the basis of one, eventhough serious, incident. The training of the air defence troops is based on one main task—to prepare to rebuff armed aggression and not to allow strategic air strikes. They are ready to carry out this task.

But then, of course, it is impossible to throw May 28, 1987, out of history. Rust's plane was not a difficult target. We know that. But a few people know how negligently some of our officers were performing their duty. The Commander-in-Chief of the Air Defence Forces went home that night knowing nothing at all about the incident. There were no reports. Each person responsible got his due for that.

My new appointment was a bolt out of the blue for me. The Defence Minister phoned first. He invited me to his study and read me the draft order. I had some objections—firstly, I'd served in the infantry all my life, and, secondly, my age—maybe it would be better to appoint someone younger. Thirdly there was much too little time to cope with the problems which had become apparent.

After that I met with General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, who, according to the Constitution, is the head of the Defence Council of the country. He also prsented me to the Politbureau. All my wishes were heard. I was given the time and the means to deal with the task. Now I only have to work.

[Teplyakov] According to the ABM Treaty, both the USSR and the USA have the right to set up a zone of ABM defence in a vitally important area. As we know, one zone covers Moscow. Why was this area chosen precisely, and is it possible, within the limits of keeping a military secret, to describe what this zone looks like and how it operates? Can it be said that the capital has a 100-per-cent defence?

[Tretyak] Let us, first of all, finalize the essence of the question. According to the 1972 ABM Treaty, the USSR and the USA have the right to set up two zones of ABM defence each in vitally important areas, but, in keeping

with the additional protocol of 1974, the number became one each. The Americans chose the base for heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles in Grand Forks and we chose Moscow. The USA chose to safeguard its means of attack, while the USSR chose to protect its capital, with an eight million or so population, a world cultural centre.

The ABM zone of the Soviet capital conforms to each and every letter of the ABM Treaty, no more and no less, and is of adequate reliability. But still, I think that today we should speak not so much about reaching the high effectiveness of ABM as about the strict adherence to app provisions of the Treaty, with simultaneous reduction of the arsenal of strategic attack weapons.

[Teplyakov] The INF Treaty is the first step towards a world without nuclear weapons. Only recently many people refused to believe the possibility of making such a step. It is interesting to think what our army will be like some 30 years later, when celebrating not its 70th but its 100th anniversary. The liquidation of all military units, down to the last soldier—this would be the way to rid ourselves of all contradictions. That's what many people say, including the generals. Is that so?

[Tretyak] The contradictions in the world are created not by armies, but by politics conducted by classes, by states and coalitions of states. As a man who went through the war from the beginning to the end, and who saw blood and death, I'd of course welcome any decision making it possible to have only guards of honour and brass bands in the army. Because a world without weapons and violence is the ideal of socialism. However, detente is, as yet, in its first stages only. We've a long way to cover, and not everything depends on our country alone. History has seen many sharp turns, and we should be ready for them.